

JEVADHARA

A JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION

SOME ASPECTS OF BIBLICAL MAN'S WORSHIP OF GOD

THE PSALMS: INVITATION TO WORSHIP

C. M. Cherian

THE PROPHETS AND CULT

M. Lucas

JESUS AND JEWISH WORSHIP

Mathew Vellanickal

JESUS, THE HIGH PRIEST OF THE NEW LAW

Bernard Brys

ARADHANA: A LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDY

K. Luke

MATTHEW 16:13-16: AN EXEGETICAL STUDY

Arvind Sharma

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL BULLETIN

K. Luke

BOOK REVIEW

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Editorial	117
The Psalms: Invitation to Worship	119
<i>C. M. Cherian</i>	
The Prophets and Cult	132
<i>M. Lucas</i>	
Jesus and Jewish Worship	142
<i>Mathew Vellanickal</i>	
Jesus, the High Priest of the New Law	162
<i>Bernard Brys</i>	
Ārādhana: a Lexicographical Study	172
<i>K. Luke</i>	
Matthew 16:13-16: an Exegetical Study	187
<i>Arvind Sharma</i>	
Bibliographical Bulletin	195
<i>K. Luke</i>	
Book Review:	207
Metanoia Faith, Covenant	

JEEVADHARA

— A Journal of Christian Interpretation —

To our Subscribers and Readers :-

1. Jeevadhara is a bi-monthly in two editions, English and Malayalam. The two editions are published alternately every month.
2. The Editorial Board does not necessarily endorse the individual views of contributors.
3. Subscriptions are payable in advance and must be sent to:-
The Manager, Jeevadhara,
Alleppey - 688001, India.
Inland subscriptions are best sent by M. O.
4. Exchanges, books for reviews, and queries should be addressed to:-
The General Editor, Jeevadhara,
Alleppey - 688001, India.
But articles for publication may be sent to the respective Section Editors.
5. For a book to be reviewed in Jeevadhara, two copies have to be sent.

Subscription Rates :-

Indian:	Rs	12/-	(Malayalam)
	Rs	15/-	(English)
Foreign:	\$	6/-	(U. S. A.)
			or its equivalent abroad.

N. B. Air surcharge, if required, will be extra.

The Word of God

SOME ASPECTS OF BIBLICAL MAN'S WORSHIP OF GOD

Editor :

K. Luke

Theology Centre
Alleppey 688001
Kerala, India

JEEVADHARA

GENERAL EDITOR

Constantine Manalel

LITERARY EDITOR

C. A. Sheppard

SECTION EDITORS

The Problem of Man :

The Word of God :

The Living Christ :

The People of God :

The Meeting of Religions :

The Fullness of Man :

K. Luke

Samuel Rayan

Xavier Koodapuzha

John B. Chethimattam

Joseph Thayil

SECTIONAL BOARD OF EDITORS

Mathew Vellanickal

C. M. Cherian

George Mangatt

J. M. Pathrapankal

George Soares-Prabhu

R. J. Raja

Odilo Maria Lucas

Editorial

Theologians now lay emphasis on the special role the experience of the numinous has played in the history of man's religious life. They have often pointed out that man's spontaneous reaction to this experience takes concrete form and shape in thought and action: whereas the former is the source of everything that ranges from primitive myth to the the most subtle form of speculative theology, the latter gives rise to what we call cult.

As far as Biblical man is concerned (under this title we include the believers of the two Testaments) what we have just said will mean that an encounter with God, the Lord and Master of history, is the foundation of life of worship of Him. It is the purpose of the present number of *Jeevadhara* to elucidate this most important and basic truth, whose bearing upon the liturgical renewal now going in the Church remains quite obvious. Unfortunately, because of the limitations of time and space, the editors have not been able to do full justice to the topic of the current issue, and only some specific aspects of biblical tradition are studied in the articles.

C. M. Cherian's paper presents the cultic background of the Psalms, for, as is now generally recognized, the Psalter is not a collection of spiritual songs but rather the hymnal that was composed in of view a cult. M. Lucas surveys the prophets and describes their attitude towards the cult, an attitude that was rooted in their experience of God and motivated by their strong awareness of the Lord's ethical demands. In fact, apart from the ethical element, the external forms of cult remain life-less and meaningless. Mathew Vellanickal studies the Jewish cult of the NT age and Jesus' position vis-à-vis the worship of the times. All will agree that the liturgy of the Church has its moorings in synagogal worship, and Jesus himself took an active part in the Jewish worship of his age, but he had also his own ideas about the cult of God in spirit and truth. Bernard Brys for his part gives a succinct synthesis of the theology of Jesus' priesthood as

developed in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The community of God's people in the NT has only one priest who is none other than Jesus, the risen one who ascended to heaven; the awareness of this fact will help us to view the Church's public worship in the proper perspective. Studies on Israel's sacrifices and feasts, on the celebration of the Eucharist in the primitive Church, etc. will have been quite in place in the present number, but practical considerations did not permit inclusion of them in this issue. The section editor has, in his paper, tried to bring out the significance of the term *aradhana*. The bibliographical bulletin, it is hoped, will make the reader acquainted with some publications which, though landmarks in the field of Indology and Biblical scholarship, will not, unfortunately, be reviewed in the periodicals we generally get in our seminaries.

A new feature of this issue is the inclusion of an article by Arvind Sharma, student of theology at the Harvard University Divinity School. The general policy of *Jeevadhara* is to publish articles that have some bearing upon the theme discussed in the various issues, and if this rule has been relaxed in this number, it is only in order to encourage the budding generation of theologians to do original and independent research.

Lastly, the general editor and the section editor wish to thank contributors for their kind and generous co-operation which has made possible the publication of this issue. In spite of their heavy schedule and commitments, they have most considerately responded to our requests, and the generosity they have shown should help the readers to have a better understanding and appreciation of the Church's liturgy.

Calvary College,
Trichur 680004

K. Luke

The Psalms: Invitation to Worship

Many a modern believer is not convinced that a person has to go to church or mosque or temple in order to offer worship to God. What is important is that our recognition of the Truth of God must issue in a "worshipful" attitude towards our fellowmen. Such an attitude is to be expressed in the whole of our life rather than in specific acts or ceremonies performed at prescribed times and places. To serve God means to serve our neighbour. Where this is realized, the reality of worship is already achieved, while, on the other hand, the performance of sacred rites in a sacred place is no guarantee that God's truth is known or recognized. An external act can be a gesture devoid of spiritual content.

Such a view surely contains elements of truth, but it overlooks the corporate or social aspect of our worship of God. Can worship be something purely personal and private and spontaneous? Is it necessary that a people's worship should express itself in a public cult consisting of traditional observances, established rites, ceremonies and fixed formulas? How can the performance of prescribed cultic acts be sufficiently meaningful to the individual worshipper? Can the cult, suitably carried out, have an important function in the life of a religious community? Can it lead to the deepening and enriching of their devotional life? A careful study and use of the Psalms can help us to answer these and other questions which are relevant to our own worship.

The community-awareness of the Israelite believer

What God did in the *Exodus* events was to *gather* the demoralized Hebrew slaves into a new people who were proud of being God's chosen people. Their bond of unity was their common recognition of the God who had granted them deliverance through the ministry of His prophet, Moses. It is this intervening action of God that constituted them into a *worshipping*

community. We may be sure that from then on the true Israelite worshipper was conscious of being part of this community created by God. When he presented himself before God in prayer, he was conscious of not being alone. His own experience of God's love and power had significance not only for himself but also for the whole community. It was important that it should share in his experience, and that he should share in their experience of God's presence and activity in their midst. God's benefits, received by the individual, are not to be allowed to remain hidden; they have to be proclaimed. Such proclamation is needed for the building up of the believing community (cf. I Peter 2,9).

This spirit of common worship finds admirable expression in Psalm 22:

I will tell of Your Name to my brethren....

from You comes my praise in the great congregation....

The Psalmist is conscious of belonging to a definite religious tradition established originally by God's mighty work in history, and subsequently preserved and guided by Him. The individual Psalmist shares in the whole heritage of God's people, in all its spiritual riches. He owes a debt of deep gratitude to the community that has nurtured him spiritually, and ultimately to God who called this community into existence. His own experience of God's wonderful working is but a confirmation of the community's past experience on definite historic occasions. This community has a right to receive from him his personal testimony. All this suggests the reason for the statements in Psalm 40:

I have told the glad news of deliverance in the great congregation... I have not hid Your saving help within my heart...

These sentiments give us an insight into the deep meaning of "sharing" in our prayer and worship: cf. Pss 26,12; 35,18; 52,9.

The Psalmists are aware that their proclamation of God's favours to them will "overflow in many thanksgivings to God" (II Cor. 9, 12). They invite all the faithful to join them in *their* praise of God:

Sing praises to the Lord, O you His saints,
and give thanks to His holy Name (Ps 30,4).

All this must make the Christian faithful reflect about what God's action in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ and the creation of the Church ought to mean for them in their life and worship.

The Psalmists' love of the Temple as the place of God's special presence

What we have just said helps us to understand the Psalmists' great love for the Temple. If their longing was to praise God and to thank Him "in the midst of the great congregation, in the mighty throng", where could they satisfy this desire except in the Temple? It is the urge to common worship that necessitates the Temple. Where this urge is lacking or missing we have something less than the richness of the Jewish and Christian experience of worship.

O Lord, I love the habitation of Your house,
the place where Your glory dwells (Ps 25, 1).

In the Temple the Psalmist has an experience of the God who had manifested Himself to His people through long centuries. Psalm 84 reveals to us with particular clarity how deep was the Israelite believer's attachment to the Temple and its services and celebrations:

How lovely is Your dwelling place, O Lord of hosts!

My soul longs, yea faints for the courts of the Lord . . .

The highest happiness that he can dream of is to dwell in the Lord's house, and ever to sing His praises (v. 4).

In Psalms 42 and 43 we find that the Psalmist is somehow prevented from going to Jerusalem and taking part in the Temple worship. He is profoundly grieved at this deprivation. He asks:

When shall I come and behold the face of God?

What was this experience of "beholding the face of God"? Is there reference here to some ceremony in the Temple which had the character of a theophany? Did some ceremony symbolically represent God coming to the congregation and manifesting Himself to them as He came to His people in Egypt and at Sinai?

I have looked upon You in the sanctuary,
beholding Your power and glory . . . (Ps 63, 2).

Were the historical events in which God had manifested Himself to His people dramatized and re-enacted in some way in a cultic representation?

There is clear reference to a theophany in the opening words of Psalm 50: "Our God comes; He does not keep silence; before Him is a devouring fire; round about Him a mighty tempest" (v. 3). This is not the description of an event that happened in the past. Verse 2 says: "Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God shines forth". God's coming forth takes place in the present. He is addressing His people here and now. Scholars are of opinion that this Psalm could have been used at the Festival of Tabernacles celebrated at the beginning of the New Year. This celebration must have included a ceremony for the renewal of the Covenant. The words of the Psalm would be appropriate in such a context. But whether its words refer to a symbolical representation or ritual re-enactment of God's coming to deliver His people cannot be decided with certainty. The words are perhaps best explained on the supposition of a cultic drama in the Temple which was their occasion.

The same question arises when other Psalms speak of the worshipper as "beholding the beauty of the Lord" in the Temple (Ps 27,4), or of "seeing the God of gods in Zion" (Ps 84,7). Psalm 36,8 speaks of the faithful as "being abundantly satisfied with the fatness" of God's house (Hebrew text). In Ps 65,4 the faithful express the hope that they will be "satisfied with the goodness" of God's house. These two passages seem to refer to communion meals, which were the concluding part of certain sacrificial offerings (peace offerings), at which God Himself was the invisible Host (cf. Ps 23,5-6).

The cultic setting of most Psalms

Some Scripture narratives outside the Psalms help us to form an idea of the essential character of the Temple liturgy in the pre-exilic and post-exilic periods. They contain precious information about ceremonies held in the Temple, about the role of music in worship, and about sacred processions. With help from a few of these texts a rough reconstruction will be attempted of the cultic setting to which a large number of the Psalms un-

doubtedly belong. Very many distinguished Western scholars have been studying this subject in the past few decades. In what is said here the findings of their research are the guide.

In a remarkable passage, in order to evoke an image of supreme happiness, Isaiah speaks of songs heard on a night of sacred pilgrimage, and of the glad hearts of those who walk to the sound of the pipe on their way to the Lord's house in Jerusalem (30,29). When the Ark of God was being brought to Jerusalem from Kiriath-Jearim, we are told that "David and all the house of Israel were making merry before the Lord with all their might, with lyres and harps and tambourines and castanets and cymbals" (II Sam. 6,5). The chronicler tells us that "David also commanded the chiefs of the Levites to appoint their brethren as the singers who should play loudly on musical instruments, on harps and lyres and cymbals, to raise sounds of joy" (I Chron. 15,16).

Certain events in the reign of King Jehoshaphat of Judah (870-848), narrated in II Chronicles, shed more light on the forms of Temple worship. The King was threatened with war by the Moabites and the Ammonites. In a solemn ceremony in the Temple the King prayed for the Lord's intervention to protect His people. During the ceremony the Spirit of the Lord came upon a Levite, and he promised the King complete victory over his enemies: "Fear not, and be not dismayed; tomorrow go out against the enemy, and the Lord will be with you" (II Chron. 20, 17). In response to this divine assurance, the King and the Levites stood up in the Temple to praise the Lord with loud singing. Even before the battle took place, the King "appointed men to sing to the Lord and praise the splendour of His holiness as they went before the armed troops, and they sang: 'Give thanks to the Lord, for His love endures for ever' (v. 21)." After gaining victory in the battle, all came back to Jerusalem "with harps and lyres and trumpets to the House of the Lord".

We need not here go into the question of the historical accuracy of this narrative. The picture of Temple worship which it sketches is supported by the evidence of a number of Psalms. The mention of the Levite prophesying victory to the King during the ceremony of intercession is a particularly useful detail. It

helps us to understand the abrupt transitions which occur in a number of the Psalms. They suggest that a class of prophets must have had some official standing in the Temple, and have been associated with the priests in the conducting of ceremonies.

Thus a number of Laments are best explained as if they had been composed to accompany a Temple ritual where, at a certain point, a prophet intervened to utter an oracle assuring the suppliant of Yahweh's favourable answer to his complaint. These Psalms begin as laments, but end on a note of victory or full confidence, and even express anticipated thanksgiving. Compare the second part of Psalms 6, 22 and 31 with their first part.

Some Psalms incorporate an oracle of assurance seemingly uttered by a cult prophet. Thus Psalm 12 begins with an urgent plea, but its middle part is the assurance given by the Lord himself, and apparently communicated by His prophet. In the Temple chanting of such a Psalm there must have been a change of speaker. Similarly Ps 27 is also a petition for deliverance from troubles, but the closing verse is a message from the Lord. In Ps 95, the first part is a hymn of praise, expressing complete trust in Yahweh, but the second part is a prophetic oracle which assumes the form of a sharp rebuke.

If modern readers tend to misunderstand certain Psalms it is often because they are unaware of the cultic background to which they originally belonged. Such is the case with the "Psalms of Innocence" (Pss 5; 7; 17; 26 etc). The protestations of innocence contained in these Psalms and the impatience with the machinations of the "wicked" do not proceed from self-righteousness or a claim to absolute sinlessness. There is enough evidence in these Psalms to show that the speakers in them had been *falsely accused* of grave sins like that of idolatry which could be punished with death (Deut. 13, 7f etc). It is clear that these Psalmists were submitting to an "oath of innocence or exculpation" which they had to take in connexion with rites of purification held in the Temple:

I wash my hand in innocence
and go about Your altar, O Lord,
singing aloud a song of thanksgiving...(Ps 26).

Zion Psalms, Royal Psalms, and Psalms of the Kingship of Yahweh

No place in the world could be more wonderful than Jerusalem because it was Yahweh's chosen dwelling-place where He manifested His glory to His people. There are Psalms which reflect rites belonging to a celebration of the holiness and privileged status of Jerusalem (Pss 46; 48; 76; 84; 87; 122). These songs see Jerusalem as a city filled with every blessing precisely because Yahweh was in its midst:

Pray for the peace of Jerusalem!
May they prosper who love you!
Peace be within your walls,
and security within your towers! (ps 122).

These songs enable us to grasp something of the religious-psychological effect which the great annual festivals in Jerusalem had on the pilgrims (vide also the Songs of Ascent: Pss 120-134). Joy in Jerusalem was nothing but joy in the Lord who had chosen her. The recalling and the ritual enactment of what the Lord had done for Zion in the past (see Pss 46, 8f; 48, 12f) evoked in the pilgrims the deepest rejoicing, enthusiasm and gratitude.

The evidence in the historical books of the Old Testament has already been referred to, which shows that the reigning kings played an important part in the Temple ritual. David had not only danced before the Ark but had also offered sacrifice and pronounced a blessing on the people (II Sam. 6). Solomon offered prayer for the nation, and also blessed the people (I Kg. 8). A number of Psalms point to annual occasions when God's election of the Davidic dynasty was celebrated in the Temple with elaborate ceremonies. A procession in which the Ark was carried to the Temple and the reigning king installed must have been essential elements in such festivals.

Various ceremonies and the Psalms which accompanied them were designed to celebrate special events in the life of the king such as his accession (Pss 2; 101; 110), or wedding (Ps 45), or the anniversary of the founding of the Davidic dynasty (Pss 72; 132), or the undertaking of some critical military expedition

(ps 20), or the success which attended such an expedition (Pss 18, 21).

These Psalms see the King as the representative of the people whom God has chosen for Himself, and to whom He has made solemn promises. It is God's purpose to endow the leader of His people with every divine gift so that he can be God's effective agent of the realization of His plans. The royal Psalms convey the highest idea of divine-human cooperation, of kingly-priestly mediation. They set before the King the lofty ideal which he is called upon to follow, and they look forward to the day when the privileged descendant of David, the Messiah, will bring about the definitive fulfilment of the divine plan. Meanwhile the descendants of David had to work out their destiny and that of the people in free conscious dependence on the Divine King. There is no magical road to the Messianic fulfilment. The well-being of the nation is necessarily bound up with the conduct of king and people. Thus the royal Psalms challenge the nation to a constant renewal of their fidelity to God and His demands.

Psalms 24 could have been used at the celebration of the anniversary of Solomon's bringing of the Ark into the newly-built Temple. Ps 132 belongs to an annual festival celebrating the founding both of the Temple in Jerusalem and of the Davidic dynasty. The first part is an earnest prayer asking for God's continued favour to the house of David, while the second part is an oracular response in which the worshippers are assured that Yahweh will be always mindful of His promise to David and his house.

Ps 89 is a deeper examination of the same theme. It celebrates God's mighty acts in creation and reflects how his rule of the world is characterized by justice and righteousness, love and fidelity. It expresses the realization that God's blessing on the house of David must be conditional on its obedience. Then there is a long lament over some serious humiliation that the Davidic King has suffered. The Psalm does not close with any oracle of promise, but with a passionate plea for deliverance.

Beyond and above the earthly king, Israel contemplated the heavenly King, the Creator of heaven and earth, the Lord of

all history. The three chief liturgical feasts — the Passover, Pentecost and the feast of Tabernacles — were surely meant to be essentially a renewal of the Covenant that Yahweh had made with Israel. They involved the people's acknowledgment of the kingship of Yahweh. There is late evidence showing the firm popular belief that national prosperity would depend on the due celebration of these feasts (see Zech. 14, 16-17). A number of Psalms are obviously ritual texts that were used at these Yahweh festivals: Pss 47; 93; 96-99. They express the people's sense of the exaltation of their God as Creator and supreme Lord of the universe. They are full of the people's wonder at the fact that this exalted Lord had chosen them as His people.

Joy in worship

Numerous passages in the Psalms indicate that Israelite Temple worship was marked by much rejoicing, singing and dancing. This aspect of the Psalms ought particularly to interest the Christian faithful because it is doubtful whether, in our efforts at renewing our liturgy, we have paid enough attention to its dimension of joy. Israelite pilgrims went to the Temple on the occasion of the chief agricultural festivals in order to praise and thank God for His gifts in Nature, and above all to rejoice in Him, their King and Saviour. The note of joy in the Lord is present in all the Psalms (except, of course, the laments), but it is specially evident in the Psalms in honour of the Kingship of Yahweh. Characteristically they begin:

O sing to the Lord a new song! (96, 1 etc).

Obviously such songs were meant to accompany Temple ceremonies, and were sung by trained choirs. The element of praise predominates in them, and the joy they expressed when sung loudly in the Temple must have been infectious:

Let the heavens be glad, and let the earth rejoice;
let the sea roar, and all that fills it;
let the field exult and everything in it!
Then shall all the trees of the wood sing for joy
before the Lord, for He comes;
He comes to judge the earth.
He will judge the world with righteousness,
and the peoples with his truth (Ps 96, 11f).

The firm basis of this cultic exultation is the conviction about the Lord's love and power, His truth and righteousness. How remarkably this conviction remained unimpaired and as strong as ever in spite of all the terrible calamities that had befallen the people, especially in their exile (see Pss 81, 1f; 98 4f)! The form of certain Psalms (118; 136) indicates that they were intended to be sung antiphonally either by two choirs or by a choir and the congregation.

Ps 68 deserves special mention here. It is a processional hymn in honour of Yahweh. It speaks of "the singers in front the minstrels last and between them maidens playing timbrels" (v. 25). From beginning to end it is a most loving meditation of the God who has wrought for His people one wonder after another, and a rejoicing in His love and power and unremitting care:

Make God arise... let the righteous be joyful...

Sing to God, sing praises to His Name, lift up a song to Him...

Some Psalms refer to dancing, and imply musical accompaniment; others mention musical instruments:

Let Israel praise the Lord's name with dancing (Ps. 149. 3; see 87, 7; 150, 4).

Make melody to the Lord with timbrel and lyre (Ps. 149. 3; see 150).

The Psalms as the God-given key to the spirit of ritual worship

Worship is more than rites and ceremonies, more than sacred reading and singing. The complaint of the prophets was that the people were quite enthusiastic about the performance of rites and ceremonies, about sacrifices, offerings, processions and pilgrimages, but still often enough they were not themselves possessed of the spirit of worship, the spirit of adoration, penitence and self-surrender. If they had this spirit, they would be holy as God is holy, and this would have appeared in their daily life, in their human relationships, in their practice of justice and righteousness.

The offering of sacrifice ought to mean that the worshippers recognized that everything came from God as His precious gift. If this were done the people would be grateful to God, and would show their gratitude by responding to His demands of love of one's neighbour and service and compassion. In practice Temple sacrifices rarely meant that this inner conversion and transformation had been effected in the worshippers (cf. Is 1, 10f; Jer 7, 9f; Amos 5, 21f). In such cases these external forms were devoid of meaning and hence unacceptable to God who cares more for the heart than for the act.

The Psalms that were composed to accompany sacrifices and offerings sought to evoke the true spirit that ought to animate the worshippers. They express the meaning of the external forms. Their use was calculated to enable people to enter into the true spirit of worship and to make the external act truly *their* personal act of surrender to God. The inspired priests or prophets who wrote the Psalms were helping the worshippers personally to appropriate the significance of the external rites. Here we are faced with the perennial problem of external cultic worship. The Psalms are invariably meant to emphasize the priority of the interior spirit of self-surrender. To have this spirit is a "sacrifice" to God even without the performance of any external rites:

The sacrifice acceptable to God is a broken spirit (Ps 51, 17). The external act without the interior spirit would be un-availing.

The Temple rites ceased for long decades when the Temple was destroyed. Even then the Psalms, the record of it behind the acts, continued to evoke this spirit in the Jewish faithful. Today in Christian use the Psalms exist divorced from the rites which they accompanied once; but they remain a most powerful divine aid towards creating in us the *spirit* of true worship.

Sacrifice and offering You did not desire...

then I said, Lo, I come...

I delight to do Your will, O my God... (Ps 40, 6f).

This Messianic passage says that what God has done is "to dig ears" for us. What is characteristic of men, God's favourite creatures, is that they are able to listen to God, to understand,

and to respond in love and self-surrender. That we enter into this personal relationship with God is His first demand on us; it is the very essence of worship (see Pss 69, 30f; 141, 2f). The test of true worship is that it issues in conduct that conforms to God's holiness.

Conclusion: the primacy of praise in the Psalms

Worship is our approaching God in response to His approach. God's greatest gift to us is Himself. The supreme end of worship is therefore to be lifted up into the sphere of God's own life, to be conformed to His Spirit, His Truth, His Purpose. To do this is to worship Him in spirit and in truth. It means resting in God, rejoicing in Him for His own sake. Such worship is the one thing necessary, an end in itself, not a means to some thing beyond it.

The psalmists have mastered the secret of such intimacy with God and such worship. How wonderfully rich is the conception of God set forth in the Psalms! It is by His word that the heavens and earth were made (Ps 33). All creation proclaims His glory (Ps 19). This great God is not far from each one of us; He searches out our paths, and is acquainted with all our ways (Ps 139). His faithfulness endures to all generations (Ps 119). He will not violate His Covenant or alter the word that went forth from His lips (Ps 89). He forgives all our iniquity, and heals all our diseases; He is merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love. He knows our frame of mind; He remembers that we are dust (Ps 103).

The Lord is just in all His ways,
and kind in all His doings,
the Lord is near to all who call upon Him,
(to all who call upon Him in truth),
He fulfils the desire of all who fear Him,
He hears their cry, and saves them (Ps 145).

To know God in this way is to want to praise Him unceasingly!
O Lord, our Lord, how majestic is Your name in all
the earth! (Ps 8)

I will bless the Lord at all times;
His praise shall continually be in my mouth.
My soul makes its boast in the Lord;

let the afflicted hear and be glad.

O magnify the Lord with me,

and let us exalt His name together! (Ps 34)

Those who have been raised to such a relationship with the Lord must live a life of undying joy in Him — a new life. They should be able to face whatever life holds for them with a quiet confidence and an indomitable courage and optimism. They dwell in the shelter of the Most High, in the shadow of the Almighty. They need not fear any evil (Ps 91). God shows them the path of life; in His presence they experience the fulness of joy (Ps 16). Obviously this does not mean that they will be spared the troubles of this life. But they will hold fast to God even when they are tormented:

Will You be angry with us for ever?...

Will you not revive us again,

that Your people may rejoice in You?... (Ps 85)

The only concern of the Psalmists is that all men may learn to worship God in spirit and in truth through His steadfast love and fidelity manifested to them as effective realities in the whole of their existence. God chose the Psalmists as effective agents of a wonderful revelation of His love. Even today they have an important mission to fulfil towards their fellowmen — to be the effective instruments of God's gift of worship in spirit and in truth.

Vidya Jyoti
Delhi - 6

C. M. Cherian

The Prophets and a Cult

We are all aware that there has arisen in the Church a lot of rethinking about, and reappraisal of, the nature of a cult and public worship. The present generation of Catholics finds little or no meaning at all in the traditional forms of worship. As a result the age-old liturgical expressions of cult with their Latinism have been, to put it bluntly, toppled over and are yielding place to new forms of approach to God. In the face of the actual situation in the Church, it might be legitimate and profitable to ask oneself the question: "Has the Word of God as recorded in the Bible anything to contribute to the present liturgical renewal?" Well, it has. It is not the intention of this article to run through the whole Bible. This study will be limited to a brief survey of the prophets and their attitude towards the cult.

Prophetic vocation and the cult

A close study of the prophetic literature reveals that the prophet is a man who experiences God immediately, a man to whom God's transcendence, holiness and salvific will are made known in a way not granted to any ordinary person. Under the impact of God's action on him, the prophet pronounces judgment on the past, present and future.¹ Being caught up in the world of the divine, he judges his contemporaries and denounces sin as a breach of the covenant relationship, and calls Israel back to a life of faithfulness.

The sense of personal vocation is the key-note of the attitude of the prophets towards established religion in general and to the cult in particular. Their immediate experience of Yahweh coloured their entire approach which was first and foremost a proclamation of the divine reality in its historical operations. All the important themes contained in the message of

1. Cf. H. Renckens, *The Religion of Israel* (1966), p. 229; B. Vawter, *Introduction to the Prophetic Books* (1964), pp. 26 ff.

the prophets can ultimately be traced back to their consciousness of the living and holy God who, through the Covenant, had associated himself in the most intimate fashion with the people of Israel.²

While we want to expound the attitude of the prophets towards the cult, it must be noted at the outset that it is precarious to generalize beyond a certain point regarding their message.³ Even a cursory reading of the prophetic literature would reveal that the prophets differed from one another not only in temperament, but in their messages. All the prophets of the 8th century B. C., for example, attacked the elaborate and often empty ritual of the Temple, but it would be arbitrary to limit ourselves to this specific point in their preaching. We can understand their attitude only if we study their writings in the light of the history of the times. Before we scan the prophetic literature chronologically, it is necessary to cast a cursive glance at the religion of Canaan, its impact upon the Israelites, and the reaction of the prophets to it.

Israel and the Canaanite religion⁴

The religion of Canaan was polytheistic and naturalistic, and it exercised a profound influence upon the people of Israel after they had occupied the land and settled down there. They learned the art of agriculture from their predecessors. The agrarian life of the Canaanites was closely linked with the cult of Baal, to whom the fertility of the land was ascribed, and this cult also entailed a lot of sexual orgies and practices like sacred prostitution.⁵ The religion of Canaan proved a temptation to the people of Israel who were unaccustomed to an agrarian way of life. They therefore turned quite naturally to the gods of the land they had occupied. They did not mean to deny Yahweh, the God of Exodus and the Covenant. They wished to serve him and also Baal. They did not feel that the two religions were

2. G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* II (1965), pp. 197f.

3. J. Bright, *Jeremiah* (The Anchor Bible, 1965), p. xxiii.

4. Discussions in R. E. Y. Scott, *The Relevance of the Prophets* (1969), pp. 195 ff; S. Winward, *A Guide to the Prophets* (1968), pp. 49 ff.

5. Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

mutually exclusive. Elements of ritual and mythology and the debased practices of fertility cults were taken over from the Canaanite religion and incorporated into the worship of Yahweh. Many of the Canaanite sanctuaries, where Baal was worshipped, were converted into Israelite places of worship, and this meant the absorption of many pagan rites. To these sanctuaries came the Israelites with gifts and they, together with the indigenous groups, celebrated communal festivals. And these celebrations were often occasions for drunkenness and sexual orgies.

The reaction of the prophets

In the light of what has been said about the experience of the prophets of God, it is not difficult to imagine their reaction when confronted with the syncretistic tendencies of their contemporaries. They attacked their practices root and branch. The classical prophets uttered their stringent criticism of the cult with a moral insight and radical consistency never known before. Their violent attack on syncretism was rooted in the traditions of the past, particularly in their awareness of the covenant and its demands upon Israel as a whole. Their main endeavour was to hinder Israel from apostasy, and in every utterance of theirs this preoccupation comes to the fore. As B. Vawter observes, "The religion of the prophets was the measure-rod against which the political, social, the moral and cultic institutions of Israel had to be laid. It is this that gives unity to the prophetic programme - it was, in fact, the only programme that the prophets had."⁶ Let us now look at the prophets themselves. We start with the pre-exilic prophets.

Amos and Hosea

Amos was a native of the southern kingdom of Judah but exercised his ministry in the northern kingdom of Israel, and his attitude towards the pompous and colourful cult of the times was altogether negative. There was in the northern kingdom, the sanctuary at Bethel, with its sacred calf and syncretistic practices, which he condemned in unequivocal terms. But this attitude of his cannot be dissociated from social injustice which was rampant in the kingdom: the rich had fine houses and lived in

6. Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 49.

comfort, but there were people belonging to the lower strata of society who were oppressed and exploited and were regarded as expendables in the new power structure. It is at this juncture that Amos, single-minded as he was and heedless of practical consequences, uttered the judgment of God on this corrupt society.⁷

"I hate," he says, "I spurn your pilgrim-feasts; I will not delight in your sacred ceremonies. When you present your sacrifices and offerings I will not accept them, nor look on the buffaloes of your shared offerings. Spare me the sound of your songs; I cannot endure the music of your lutes..." (5: 21 - 23) Why this condemnation of a solemn cult which was conducted at the royal sanctuary? It was because the people were not sincere: their life gave the lie to their religious observances. Amos says: "Listen to this, you who grind the destitute and plunder the humble, you who say, 'When will the new moon be over so that we may sell corn? When will Sabbath be passed so that we may open our wheat again, giving short measure in the bushel and taking overweight in the silver, tilting the scales fraudulently, and selling the dust of the wheat; that we may buy the poor for silver and the destitute for a pair of shoes?'" (8: 4 - 6) Only in the context of this historical background must Amos's invectives against an external cult be understood: his words should not be taken away from the *Sitz im Leben*, the life situation, in which they were uttered.

Hosea was the younger contemporary of Amos and prophesied in the northern kingdom, and so the background described above holds good also for his ministry. His 'marriage' story is but the story of Israel's relations with Yahweh, relations which can all be summed up in one word: infidelity. Yahweh is Israel's husband, but she runs after other lovers, who, in concrete terms are the co-worshippers of Baal. "They ask advice from a block of wood and take their orders from a fetish; for a spirit of wantonness has led them astray and in their lusts they are unfaithful to their God. Your men sacrifice on mountain-tops and burn offerings on the hills, under oak and poplar and the terebinths' pleasant shade. Therefore your daughters play the wanton and your sons' brides commit adultery, because your men resort

7. Winward, *op. cit.*, pp. 36f.

to wanton women and sacrifice with temple prostitutes" (4: 12-19). Hosea was saddened and angered at the state of affairs he saw around him, and he referred to the great flaw in the character of Israel as a spirit of harlotry and meant it literally and metaphorically.

It is against the background described above that we have to view Hosea's condemnation of a cult (cf. 4: 15, 17-19; 5: 3, 6-7; 8: 11-18; 10: 1-2; 12: 12). His position is very well summed up in the statement, "Loyalty is my desire, not sacrifices, not whole offerings but the knowledge of God" (6: 6). He viewed Israel's cult from the Covenant point of view. His own married life was a prophecy in action. Gomer, the woman he married, had rejected his love, and by her infidelity had inflicted great sufferings upon her husband. This experience enabled him to understand in depth how God suffered on account of Israel's faithlessness, which he described in a language coloured by his experiences with Gomer: "For a wanton spirit is in them, and they care nothing for Yahweh" (5: 4). This internal apostasy was manifested in the debased cult of the times. No wonder, therefore, that it was condemned by Hosea,

Isaiah of Jerusalem

Nowhere else in the books of the classical prophets is there a more thorough-going repudiation of the Israelite cult than in the preaching of this prophet.⁸ Isaiah might have begun as an 'official' prophet, but at any rate he received his call to the prophetic ministry in the temple of Jerusalem. The first Chapter of the present Book of Isaiah contains practically all that can be said against the external cult of the age: "Your countless sacrifices, what are they to me?" says the Lord. "I am sated with the whole offerings of rams and the fat of buffaloes; I have no desire for the blood of bulls, of sheep and he-goats. Whenever you come to enter my presence - who asked you for this? No more shall you trample my courts. The offer of your gifts is useless, the wreck of sacrifice is abhorrent to me. New moons and sabbaths and assemblies, sacred seasons and ceremonies, I cannot endure. I cannot tolerate your new moons and your

8. Vawter, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

festivals; they have become a burden to me, and I can put up with them no longer..." (1: 11-17) These invectives against an external cult must be understood against the background of social injustice perpetrated by the people of Judah.

Micah

This prophet was a contemporary of Isaiah of Jerusalem. His prophecy contains one of the best summaries of true religion to be found in the entire Bible, for which alone his book deserves immortality.⁹ "What shall I bring when I approach the Lord? How shall I stoop before God on high? Am I to approach him with whole-offerings of yearling calves? Will the Lord accept thousands of rams or ten thousand rivers of oil? Shall I offer my eldest son for my wrongdoing, my children for my own sin? God has told you what is good; and what is it the Lord asks of you? Only to act justly, to love loyalty, to walk wisely before your God" (6: 6-8).

Jeremiah

Exegetes have often pointed out the close affinity Jeremiah's thought has with that of Hosea, for both the prophets view everything in the light of the Covenant bond. One of the greatest events of Jeremiah's age was the discovery of the book of Deuteronomy in 622 B. C., which persuaded King Josiah to inaugurate a religious reform (2 Kg. 22). He enforced the law regarding the unity of sanctuary: there is only one place where Yahweh should be worshipped, namely, the Temple of Jerusalem, and also removed several pagan practices that had crept in and vitiated the worship of the God of the Covenant. Jeremiah readily supported the Josian reform in the beginning, but later on when he saw that it did not result in the spiritual renewal he was so eagerly looking for, he was disillusioned.

Josiah was succeeded by his wicked son Jehoiakim who reversed the reform policies of his father by reintroducing idolatrous practices into the Temple. Jeremiah was enraged and preached what is known as 'the Temple Sermon' (cf. 7: 1-15; 26: 1ff). In this sermon he shattered the misguided confidence of the

9. Thus Winward, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

people and of their rulers in the Temple. He openly stated that the Temple was no guarantee for their safety. What Yahweh wanted was obedience, social justice and sincerity in worship. He certainly would not protect those who were breaking his commandments and were using the Temple, as it were, as a cave of refuge for thieves (7: 11. Cf. too Mk. 11: 17).

The Temple Sermon is followed by the prophet's words concerning sacrifice: "Add whole offerings to sacrifices and eat the flesh if you will," he says (7: 21 ff.). The people might very well partake of the sacrificial meals, but their offering would be worth nothing before God! In the beginning, at the time of the exodus from Egypt, God did not ask for sacrifices but only for obedience.

Ezekiel

The first of the exilic prophets, Ezekiel, is a link between the pre-exilic and post-exilic ones. In him we find a blending of priestly and prophetic functions. In fact he hailed from a priestly family, and he was called to the prophetic office outside the holy city and far away from the Temple, and one of the constant themes of his preaching was the terrible doom that was to befall it and the city.¹⁰ The reason for this was of course the sinfulness of the Judaeans, which is described in detail in ch. 8. Ezekiel explicitly notes that the divine presence had abandoned the holy city (11: 23).

Though a member of a priestly family, he did not say a laudatory word about the Temple cult, which he simply regarded as hypocritical mummary. A change, however, came over him after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple: henceforth he became the announcer of hope and restoration. And in the restored community of eschatological times the Temple once again appears as the centre of worship. In chs. 40-48 he describes in detail the vision he had of the restored nation and of the ideal Temple. In this Temple worship will be once again offered to the true God. He describes the altar, the ministers and the solemn liturgy, but what is more important still, he

10. Cf. W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel* (1970), p. 27.

explicitly notes that the glory of Yahweh which abandoned the former Temple will once again come and dwell in the new Temple (cf. 43: 2, 4). The cult in the new Temple is not to be put on a par with that of the first Temple, the Temple of Solomon which was destroyed, for those who worship God in the Temple of eschatological times are men who have received a new heart and a new spirit, men who have been internally transformed by Yahweh, the lord and master of history.

Deutero-Isaiah

This anonymous prophet of the Exile speaks about the rebuilding of the Temple. He explicitly notes that Yahweh says of Jerusalem, "She shall be built," and of the temple, "Your foundation shall be laid" (44: 28). The post-exilic prophets Haggai and Zechariah for their part championed the cause of the Temple and spurred the people on to action. The result of their preaching was the completion of the second Temple. We shall not discuss their work here but shall content ourselves with a brief mention of Malachi, the last of the minor prophets.

Malachi

The prophet whose words are recorded in the Book of Malachi was a man who was all in favour of the cult and advocated the offering of unblemished sacrifices in the Temple. While the ethical teaching of the great prophets is not absent from his prophecy, Malachi is concerned above all with the maintenance and quality of Temple worship, so much so that it is justifiable to call him the prophet in the service of the Temple. But he does not take it for granted that the cult has been normalized after its restoration. In fact, the longest oracle of his book (1: 6-2: 9) contains a scathing denunciation of priests who were far from being ideal. The law required that the victims offered in sacrifice should be without blemish (Lev. 22: 20-22; Dt. 15: 21; 17: 1), but the priests were accepting from the people and presenting to God, blind, lame and sick animals. Moreover by their careless and routine performance of ritual, they were despising and showing contempt for God and his worship. How could they hope to secure God's favour? "Far better shut the doors of the temple altogether, than to continue to insult the Lord with such shabby gifts! Better the sincere worship offered in all parts of

the world by the heathen, than this insulting parody offered by the priests at Jerusalem. They show their contempt for God by regarding the service of his sanctuary as a dull and boring routine."¹¹ Against all this procedure Malachi advocates a pure and sincere worship.

In the light of what has been said above, we ask: What was the attitude of the prophets towards the cult? Were they anti-cultic? To answer this question in a satisfactory way, we must know what exactly is a cult. Eichrodt describes 'cultus' as, "the expression of religious experience in concrete external actions performed within the congregation or community, preferably by officially appointed exponents and in set form."¹² A cult must then be the genuine expression of a living religion, seeking to penetrate the whole of human life. The interior and the exterior must blend together, and the external actions of worship must become the means of expressing the spiritual reality. There can be no real cult if it is not the expression of a genuine religious life which, according to the prophets, cannot be dissociated from moral life. In a cult, the expression of religious experience and ethics go together. This is precisely what the prophets strove to inculcate, for they saw, among their contemporaries, a dichotomy of cult and moral life, which they rightly condemned with an extreme severity. They never rejected a cult in principle, nor was it for them the essence of religious life. Amos's harsh words, for example, against feasts, sacrifices and liturgical songs, do not at all mean that he was altogether rejecting a cult as such. His judgment was entirely existential; he had to deal with a concrete situation in which all this had become quite meaningless inasmuch as it was an expression of nothing genuine. How could Yahweh be rightly honoured by the rites of those who despised his law? It is thus that his final words give the key to his meaning. If sacrifice and song are to mean anything, "Let justice flow like water, and integrity like an un-failing stream" (5: 24).

In this very same context we must interpret Hosea's words, "Loyalty is my desire, not sacrifice, not whole-offerings but the knowledge of God" (6: 6). In the same tone Isaiah and Jeremiah.

11. Winward, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

explicitly state that the Lord does not require offerings and sacrifices. It would not be right to interpret the unqualified affirmations of the prophets as the most radical rejection of a cult in all its forms. For them obedience to the will of God is of primary importance. "If you obey me, I will be your God and you shall be my people" (Jer. 7: 23). Along with this primary affirmation goes the polemic of the prophets against trusting in any "thing" for security and well-being. The means of grace must not be made ends in themselves. In God's sight a cult with all its concomitant rites and actions, if divorced from obedience, is just so much trash.

It is here that the message of the prophets can enlighten and encourage the liturgical renewal in the Church today and help modern man to discover anew the meaning of its approach to God through a cult in the solemn performance of public worship. External manifestations are necessary, but no form of cult, not even the most ancient, should become an end in itself. And that is precisely what the Church is striving to emphasize, especially after the Second Vatican Council. What is required of us all in this period of liturgical renewal, is the living of the Christian life in all its fullness, and it is this that gives meaning to the various forms of public worship that have made their appearance on the scene in the wake of the last Council.

Kotagiri, The Nilgiris

M. Lucas

Jesus and the Jewish Worship

When we read the Gospel texts with a view to discovering the attitude of Jesus towards the Jewish worship and all that it implied, two apparently contradictory features become immediately apparent: Jesus' respect for it and his sharp criticism of it. Above and beyond this, we see Jesus trying to replace the Jewish worship with something that is transcendent. This attempt on the part of Jesus is essentially bound up with his Messianic activity. Since the manner in which Jesus will exercise his Messianic role, i. e. as Son of God made flesh, is unique and radically new, the transcendent worship with which Jesus is trying to replace the Jewish worship is also bound to be radically new. Our main concern in this article is to see the above mentioned phenomenon exemplified in some of the important elements of Jewish worship¹.

Our chief source of information for Jesus' attitude towards the Jewish worship in the NT times is the Gospels themselves. The OT and the Mishna, a codification of Jewish laws, rules and regulations, compiled around A. D. 200 will help us to know the details of the Jewish worship in the NT times.

Public and private worship

When we consider the Jewish worship in NT times, we can distinguish between public and private forms of worship. The private worship of individuals consisted of practices such as prayers offered by the individuals at home² or in the street (Mt. 6:5), blessings to be recited before partaking of some food³, prayer when beginning to use a newly-built house⁴, blessing to be

1) For a general description of the Jewish worship in New Testament times, cf. A. Cronback, "Jewish Worship in NT Times" in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, N. Y. 1962, Vol. IV, pp. 894-903

2) Berakoth 1:1-3 3) Ibid 6:1-3 4) Ibid 9:3

pronounced upon receiving good news or bad regardless of one's location⁵ etc. As to these acts of private worship, as a whole Jesus respected and observed them⁶.

At the same time Jesus wanted utmost sincerity in all of them, namely, those acts of private worship should be a real expression of the life of each individual in his relation to God. He revealed that God is above all the Father of men and that any act of worship on the part of man should be an expression of this father-son relationship between God and man:

"When you pray, go into your room and shut the door and pray to your Father who is in secret and your Father who sees in secret will reward you" (Mt. 6:6). It is in this context that Jesus teaches the characteristically Christian prayer: the 'Our Father'.

The Public worship was always performed at fixed times and in fixed places such as the Temple, the Synagogue and other places destined for the gathering of the local worshipping community. It is this public worship that is going to be the main object of our study. Here too it is impossible to make an exhaustive analysis of all the aspects of it in the limited scope of this article. We will only try to highlight certain salient features of this public worship in their relation to Jesus.

Jewish worship and the Temple

By NT times, the Temple of Jerusalem became the only place where sacrificial worship could legally be performed, so that since its destruction in 70 A.D., Judaism has been deprived of both altar and sacrifice. But this unique position of the Temple in Jewish worship was attained after long years of hard struggle against rival sanctuaries and against a trend which favoured decentralization. We see the main efforts of centralization made under the Kings of Judah, Ezechias⁷ and Josias⁸.

5) Ibid 9:2

6) Cf. M. Vellanickal, "Prayer in the Life and Teaching of Jesus", *Jeevadhara* 2 (March-April 1972), pp. 149-52.

7) 2 Kg. 18:4, 18; 2 Ch. 29-31.

8) 2 Kg. 23. For a brief history of this centralization of the cult cf. R. DeVaux, *Ancient Israel*, London, 1961, pp. 330-343

It is commonly said that two closely connected dogmas are the fundamental determinants of Israel's religion, namely the oneness and the absoluteness of God and God's choice of Israel to be, as it were, his own people. Jerusalem and, in Jerusalem, the Temple, were the places in which these two combined realities, Yahweh and his people, met in a special manner and in the most complete and intimate union⁹. The relationship between the Jewish soul and God was always desired to be translated into practices of a liturgical nature. And in the life of the Jews as it took shape after the return from exile, the practice of public worship was orientated towards and closely bound up with the Temple.

Even the synagogues, in which we find an increasingly striking development of religious life, were often orientated towards Jerusalem¹⁰. The custom of going up to Jerusalem was observed by devout Jews even at the time of Jesus. The great feasts such as Tabernacles, Passover, Pentecost saw as many as 100,000 pilgrims gathered in Jerusalem¹¹. The songs of Ascents (Ps 119-134) express the feelings of these pilgrims as they came nearer to the city and the Temple.

The importance of the Temple in Jewish worship in NT times is clear also from the relation of the Early Christian worship to the Temple. In the first of his idealizing summaries, Luke speaks of the Christian community in Jerusalem as "day by day, attending the temple together, and breaking bread in their homes..."¹² The opening chapters of the Acts show us how much the Temple was part of the early Jewish-Christian worship. Peter and John go up there at the hour of prayer, the ninth hour¹³. The Apostles preach Jesus in the Temple area and Solomon's Portico seems to have been their favourite meeting place¹⁴. In spite of his teaching on the universality of Christ's message, Paul was also attached to the Temple and went there to pray¹⁵.

9) Cf. Y. Congar, *The Mystery of the Temple*, London 1962, pp. 83-84.

10) Cf. J. Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme Palestinien en temps de Jesus Christ*, Paris, 1935, Vol. 2, p. 138.

11) Cf. J. Bonsirven, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 121

12) Acts 2:46 13) Ibid 3:1 14) Ibid 3:11; 5:12

15) Ibid 22:17; 21:23-25

The ninth hour i. e. 3 p. m. at which Peter and John went up to the Temple¹⁶ was in NT times the hour of the evening sacrifice¹⁷, the Tamid or perpetual sacrifice¹⁸. This daily whole-burnt offering was the most important part of the regular worship of the sanctuary and one to which the Israelites were devotedly attached. Its suppression was the greatest of disasters¹⁹.

Other acts of worship in addition to the burnt offerings had developed in the temple by NT times. Before the priests began their morning sacrifices, they would assemble and recite certain passages from the Scriptures and certain prayers²⁰. After the burnt offerings had been rendered, the priests would go to the Temple porch and there, facing the multitude gathered in the courtyard, would invoke the Aaronic benediction²¹. On the Day of Atonement there was a ritual of prayer and of reading from the Scriptures, both inside the Temple edifice and in the Temple court.

Jesus' devotion to the Temple and its worship

The episode of finding of Jesus in the Temple recorded in Lk 2:41-51 shows the attitude of Jesus towards the Temple. There He stays behind in the Temple in his Father's house²². He begins by going to this Temple, to which he will return to proclaim within its walls the Messianic renewal of the entire system of worship. He stays behind in a spirit of devotion. He listens quietly and puts his questions. Yet already he in his turn gives answers that go beyond what could be expected of a child.

Here we have a significant point of departure. Jesus loved the Temple before he announced that it was transcended and before he foretold its destruction. He had much to say against

16) Ibid 3:1 17) Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 4, 3.

18) On this point see E. Schürer, *A History of the Jewish people In the time of Jesus*, New York, 1961, p. 285.

19) Cf. Dan 8:11-15; 11:31; Josephus, *Ant.* 14:30

20) Tam. 5:1 21) Num. 6:24-27; Tam. 7:2

22) The Greek phrase *en tois tou* has in common Greek Koine the exact sense of 'in the house of'. Cf. H. R. Smothers, "A Note on Luke 2:49" in *Harvard Theol. Rev.* 45 (1952), 67-69.

the human traditions of the elders and of the Pharisees, yet he said no single word against the Temple. For him it is 'his Father's House'²³ 'the house of God'²⁴, 'a house of prayer'²⁵. He will purify the Temple solely out of zeal for the house of God²⁶. He taught there often during his public ministry²⁷. Lack of respect for his Father's house roused him to anger²⁸. He forbade the carrying of loads through the Temple area²⁹. He did not condemn the Apostles for their pride in the magnificence of the structure of the Temple³⁰. He actually wept over the sad fate which was soon to befall it³¹.

Fundamentally Jesus' attitude to the Temple is the same as His attitude towards the Law. He had not come to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it³². He respects and wishes others to respect the Temple in accordance with the requirements proper to each of the sacred places in it. This is shown in one of his denunciations of the Pharisees reported by Mt 23:16-22. Here Jesus' respect for the Temple is manifested in his insistence upon sincerity and truth in religious devotion. Mt 5:23-24 shows that Jesus respected the Mosaic ritual system still in operation and also proclaimed how these religious acts were to be performed if they were to be pleasing to God.

Nevertheless the limits of Jesus' devotion to the Temple must also be noted. According to St John He went there for most of the great feasts. We find Him teaching in the Temple and bringing the leaders of the people face to face with His message³³. But the Gospels do not say expressly that He offered prayer there, although they mention several times that He prayed, above all when he was alone³⁴. The Gospels say nothing of any sacrifice offered by Jesus.

23) Jn. 2:16 24) Mt. 23:21.

25) Mt. 21:13; Mk 11:17; Lk 23:21. 26) Jn 2:17.

27) Mk. 11:11, 27; 12:35; 14:49 and par; Jn 2:14; 5:14; 7:14, 28; 8:24; 10:23; 11:56; 18:20.

28) Mk. 11:15 and par; Jn 2:14. 29) Mk. 11:16.

30) Mk. 13:1 and par. 31) Mk. 13:2 and par; Mt. 23:37.

32) Mt. 5:17. 33) Cf. Mt. 21:14, 23; Mk. 12:35; Lk. 19:47; 21:37; Jn 2:14f; 5:14; 7:28; 8:2-20, 59; 10:23; 18:20.

34) Mk. 1:35; 6:46; Lk. 3:21; 5:16; 6:12; 9:18, 28, 29; 11:1; 22:31; Jn. 17.

Jesus replacing the Temple and worship **The presentation of Jesus in the Temple** (Lk 2:22-38)

This replacing is already foreshadowed in the presentation of Jesus in the Temple. Jesus is redeemed according to the Law of Moses³⁵, yet He is Himself the Redeemer, not only of Israel, but of the whole world. He is presented in the Temple, but He is greater than the Temple³⁶. He is welcomed in the Temple by two representatives of the House of Israel who were awaiting the Comforter of their nation: Simeon and Anna, two old people, for the former dispensation has grown old and was nearing its end. Simeon in a prophetic way sees Jesus as destined to be a sign which men will refuse to recognize. Thus he foresees the Paschal drama which will replace the old Temple by the New. The whole of Israel's expectation is summed up in the persons of Simeon and Anna. In them Israel through Simeon's prophecy accepts the fact that she must give place to reality and be superseded by it³⁷. Simeon's eyes have seen the salvation, which all flesh will see³⁸ and which is prepared in the sight of all nations³⁹. Thus the universal scope of salvation characterizes the new reality of Christ. God's house will be open to all nations. They will no more be onlookers, but sharers in salvation⁴⁰.

The purification of the Temple (Mk 11:15-18, 27-33; Mt. 21:12-16, 23-27; Lk 19:45-20:7; Jn 2:14-22). All the four Gospels give this episode, though in different contexts⁴¹. They agree in placing the cleansing of the Temple at the time of Jesus' first visit there in the context of His public ministry. They agree also in presenting this episode as a decisive moment in Jesus' public life.

35) Num. 18:15f; Lev. 12:2-5; 27:6; Exod. 11:4f.

36) Mt. 12:6 37) Cf. Y. Congar, *The Mystery of the Temple*, p. 120.

38) Lk. 3:6. 39) Lk. 2:31. 40) Cf. H. Schürmann, *Das Lukas Evangelium HTKzum Nt*, III, 1, Freiburg, 1969, p. 126.

41) As to the chronology of the episode and a general comparison of the 4 accounts cf. Y. Congar, *The Mystery of the Temple*, pp. 120-150; R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, Vol. I, New York, 1966, pp. 117-120.

Cleansing the Temple; replacing of the sacrifices of the Temple

Jesus' act was, first of all, one of religious and reforming zeal. A worldly spirit was always to be found among the Jewish priests. We know from Josephus that the high priest Anna had interests in the extraordinarily flourishing trade in animals for the Pasch and for the sacrifices⁴².

But there is far more than reforming zeal in what Jesus did. His intervention is prophetic in style and Messianic in character⁴³. Like the prophets, Jesus alludes to the will of the Father that the Temple should have a different regime from the one in operation. As the prophets who opposed the malpractices and the spirit of dishonesty in worship and sacrifice were not content merely to fight against abuses, but proclaimed the real nature of the sacrifices which God wanted, so Jesus indicated that the worship of the Mosaic regime should be replaced by the worship in Spirit and Truth.

In fact the presence of the oxen and sheep in the Temple precincts is peculiar to John's narrative, and its historicity is doubted, because the Jewish sources do not mention such a practice⁴⁴. Mishnah Tractate *Shokalim* 7:2 is not really clear on where the stall of the cattle dealers were. Some authors even think that presence of any animals in the Temple precincts was extraordinary because if they got loose, they might find their way into the sanctuary and violate it. At the same time, they speak of the possibility of this on account of the struggle between Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin⁴⁵, i. e. Caiaphas allowed rival merchants to set up animal stalls in the temple precincts to take revenge on the merchants of the market place for offering hospitality to the Sanhedrin⁴⁶. Anyhow John's theological intention seems to be clear in the fact of the driving out of the oxen, the sheep and the pigeons, because in itself to sell in the precincts of the Temple

42) Josephus *Ant.* XX, 205.

43) Cf. G. Schrenk, art. on Temple in *TD NT*, 3, pp. 243-244.

44) Cf. S. Mendner, *Die Tempelreinigung*, *ZNW* 47 (1956), p. 104.

45) Cf. V. Epstein, *The Historicity of the Gospel account of the Cleansing of the Temple*, *ZNW* 55 (1964) pp. 42-58.

what was necessary for the fulfilment of obligations concerning worship, imposed by a Law from God, is not a great crime. He wants to present Jesus' action here as a proclamation of the fulfilment of what had been foretold by the prophets: "What do I care, the Lord says, how you multiply those victims of yours? I have had enough and to spare. Burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of stall-fed beasts, and the blood of calves and lambs and goats are nothing to me... vain offerings, bring them no more..."⁴⁶ Again the Psalmist says: "...all day long thy burnt-offerings smoke before me. But the gifts I accept are not cattle from thy stock... The sacrifice those must offer to God is a sacrifice of praise"⁴⁷. "No sacrifice, no offering was thy demand... Thou hast not found any pleasure in burnt-sacrifices... see then, I said, I am coming to fulfil what is written of me... to do thy will, O my God, is all my desire"⁴⁸. Jesus as the high priest of the NT fulfils this theology of sacrifice consisting of man's offering of himself and his loving obedience to God's will⁴⁹. Jesus drives out the animals, the 'material' of the legal offerings, because the time has come for men to offer the true sacrifice, a sacrifice essentially identical with prayer. The Synoptics report the words of Jesus: "My house shall be known among all the nations for a house of prayer"⁵⁰. True prayer is communion in the will of God.

Christ's body as the new sacrifice

The comment of the Evangelist in Jn 2:17, "His disciples remembered that it was written: 'Zeal for thy house will consume me'" shows that the purification of the Temple was interpreted in the light of the Resurrection with the aid of the Scripture, specially Zech 14:21: "...And there shall no longer be a trader in the House of the Lord" and Ps 69:9: "And zeal for thy house has consumed me, and the insults of those who insult thee have fallen on me." The Evangelist wants to show that this zeal for the house of God will cause opposition to Him and finally will result in His passion and death. Actually according to the Synoptics, the purification of the Temple constitutes one motive of

46) Is. 1:11-13; cf. Amos 5:25-27; Jer 7:21-23.

47) Ps. 49 (50) 8-14. 48) Ps. 39. (40): 7-9.

49) Cf. Heb. 10:5-9. 50) Mk. 11:17; Mt. 21:13; Lk 19:46.

condemnation of Jesus⁵¹. Thus he alludes to death as a prelude to the resurrection of which the next verses speak.

Hence the true sacrifice that replaces the old Jewish sacrifices is the immolated body of Christ through death and resurrection. As we saw in Heb. 10:5-9 the immolation of the body of Christ is considered as loving submission to the will of the Father. After asking for a series of sacrifices of animals, God had made it known through the prophets that he expected a better, truer sacrifice, man's offering of himself i. e. the loving obedience of his heart. The servile order of worship and sacrifice in the OT consisted in a legal transfer of property in kind. The filial order of worship and sacrifice in the New Testament, even though it includes the external features common to all liturgical acts, consists chiefly of the movement of love and obedience through which man directs his life according to the all-loving will of the Father. This is what the Eucharistic Sacrifice supremely is, for it continues the only perfectly filial sacrifice of Jesus Christ, celebrated through the ministry of priests so that, until the end of time, the faithful may share in it both bodily and spiritually. By this action Jesus shows that He is going to replace the Temple with its sacrifices by a new Temple with a new Sacrifice.

Already on several occasions, Jesus had shown that He was entitled to remove the prescription of the Mosaic Law. He had healed lepers restoring them to the community of worship from which they were excluded by the Law. When He entered the city on Palm Sunday He allowed the lame and the blind to come to Him in the Temple to be cured by Him although the Law excluded them⁵². Now by this action of purification, Jesus shows that He was going to replace the Jewish Temple and its sacrifices by a new Temple and a new Sacrifice.

Destroying and raising the Temple (Jn 2:18-22)

Jesus' cleansing of the temple area was only a step in the right direction. Jesus insisted that they were actually destroying the Temple, as the disobedience of their ancestors provoked the

51) Mk. 11:18; Lk 19:47-48.

52) Mt. 21:14-15; Lev. 21:18; 4 Kg 5:8.

destruction of the Tabernacle at Shiloh and Solomon's Temple⁵³. If they thus destroyed the Temple, Jesus claimed that he would replace it shortly with the Messianic Temple of unspecified nature. The OT speaks also of rebuilding the Temple. Ez 40-46 describe in detail the rebuilt Temple; Tob 13:10 (12) and 14:5 (7) speak of a rebuilt Tabernacle or house of God. The hope of a new Temple survived the destruction of the Herodian Temple, for the fourteenth of the 'Eighteen benedictions' unites the expectation of the rebuilding of the Temple and the coming of the Messiah⁵⁴. Hence v. 19 is an eschatological proclamation referring to the Jerusalem Temple and was understandable as such to those who knew the OT background. The insight that it referred to the body of Jesus was a post-resurrectional amplification. That the Jews understood Jesus to be referring to the Jerusalem Temple is clear in John from their retort.

The replacing of the whole religious system of the Temple by Himself (Jn 2:21-22)

The words in vv. 21-22 of Jn 2 comment on, and explain, the words 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.' The Evangelist says: "but he spoke of the temple of his body." The risen Christ will be the new Temple towards which all the people will turn.

Jesus, the Temple where God is present to man

Jn 1:14 says "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us..." The verb *skenoun* ('make a dwelling', 'pitch a tent') has important OT associations. In Exod 25:8-9 Israel is told to make a tent (the Tabernacle - *skene*) so that God can dwell among His people. In the ideal Temple described by Ezekiel 43:7, God will make His dwelling in the midst of His people for ever. So when the Prologue proclaims that the Word made his dwelling among

53) The imperative 'destroy' is ironical and found in the prophets (Amos 4:4; Is 8:9). It means "go ahead (destroying) and see what happens". Cf. R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*. Vol. 1, p. 115.

54) Cf. M. Simon, *Retour du Christ et reconstruction du Temple dans la pensée chrétienne primitive Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne* (Goguel Festschrift: Paris 1950), pp. 247-257.

men, we are being told that Christ is the new localization of God's presence on earth and that he is the replacement of the ancient Tabernacle and the Temple.

The words "we have beheld his glory" also refer to this. In the OT the glory of God is constantly connected with His presence in the Tabernacle and the Temple⁵⁵.

Jesus the Centre of worship (Jn 4:20-24).

The Samaritan woman introduces the theme of worship in her dialogue with Jesus. The Deuteronomic legislation had prescribed that there should be only one sanctuary unlike the different places of worship for the Canaanites⁵⁶. For the Jews this one place was Jerusalem, while for the Samaritans it was Mount Gerizim⁵⁷. The Samaritans had their temple on the Mount Gerizim and from the time of Jesus even up to this day they celebrate their Passover there. So we can very well understand the question of the woman to Jesus.

Jesus takes this occasion to reveal to her the place and nature of the true worship. The structure will make it clearer:

- v. 21 a. Neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem
- b. Will you worship the Father
- v. 23 b'. True worshippers will worship the Father
- a'. In Spirit and in Truth

If *ab* express negatively *a' b'* express positively the place and nature of worship. Answering the question of the woman about the place of authentic worship, Jesus says that the age-old dispute between the Jews and the Samaritans will come to an end, because worship will no more be tied down to a particular place. It will be universal as the prophets had already foretold: "From the rising of the sun to the setting, my name is great among the Gentiles and a pure offering and sacrifice will be made to my name in all the places"⁵⁸. Jesus says also that the worship of the Messianic time will be worship of the Father which is characteristic of Christian worship. This worship of the

55) Cf. Exod 24:15-16; 40:34; 1 Kg 8:10-11; Ez. 11:22; 44:4.

56) Dt. 12:2-12. 57) About this cf. J. Macdonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans*, London 1964, pp. 327-333.

58) Mal 1:11; cf. also Soph 2:11.

Father is the new cult which Christ the Son reveals and at the same time realizes.

According to the view of the Fourth Gospel the now-realized present of the new cult promised by Jesus is brought about in His person. The hour of this new worship had already basically arrived at the moment when Jesus was speaking to the Samaritan woman even though it had not yet been effectively realized, for He was there who alone made this 'worship of the Father' possible. In the person of Jesus the old cult with its blood-sacrifices and its attachment to a certain place – the Temple (of Jerusalem or Gerizim) – has been made void⁵⁹. Jesus himself is the new locus of divine worship, a truth which finds expression in the saying in Jn 2:19: "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up again." Jesus is the locus of the true worship of God since he, as the Son, is most intimately united with the Father, honours and glorifies Him, prays to Him and intercedes with Him on behalf of His own⁶⁰.

Worship in Spirit and Truth

This worship of the Father is further clarified and qualified by the addition of the phrase "in Spirit and Truth"⁶¹. Because of the negative formulation "neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem", some have concluded that any kind of worship which takes place in a specific locality accompanied by concrete and visible forms is here rejected. Thus they think that Jesus is here proposing a purely internal worship of the heart, detached from

59) Cf. R. Schnackenburg, *Christian Existence in the New Testament*, Vol. 2. Notre Dame, 1969, p. 93.

60) See Jn. 8:49; 13:31; 17:14 (Jesus honouring the Father); 11:41; 12:27–28; 17:1–5 (praying to him); 17:6–26 (Jesus' prayer of intercession.)

61) About the discussion on this phrase of A. E. J. Rawlinson, In Spiritu and Truth: an Exposition of St. John IV, 16–24, *Ep Tim 44* (1932–33), pp. 12–14; F. M. Brown, In spiritu et Veritate, *R Thom 15* (1952), pp. 245–274, 285–307; E. Freed, *The Manner of Worship in John 4:23 f*, in: *Spirit and Truth. Bibl. Study in Memory of R. T. Stamm*, Leiden 1968; R. Schnackenburg, *Christian Existence in the New Testament*, Notre Dame 1969, pp. 85–114.

any external manifestation. Others giving a Hellenist interpretation, to the 'spirit' taking the term for the inner, invisible part of man, gave a spiritualizing interpretation to the words of Jesus i.e. a worship of God only in the Spirit and not in the Body.

It is clear that this phrase has to be explained within the immediate context of the chapter and the remote context of the Gospel. In v. 24, this worship is explained by the fact that 'God is a Spirit'. As in the other two Johannine definitions of God, 'God is Light'⁶² and 'God is Love'⁶³, this also should be understood in a functional sense. If the other two definitions are to be understood as God revealing Himself in love, this also is to be understood as His manifesting and communicating Himself to man in the gift of the Spirit. The Spirit is essentially the divine power given to man by which he is born to the divine life⁶⁴, and is moved interiorly in his whole life of communion with God or Christian life⁶⁵. Therefore, worship in Spirit means worship of those who are born of the Spirit⁶⁶ and a worship in which they are moved and led interiorly by the Spirit.

In John 'the Truth' means the Word of God and Jesus⁶⁷, the revelation that is brought by Jesus and is present in Him⁶⁸. The phrase 'in Truth' is frequent in John⁶⁹ and is explained in 2 Jn 1-2: to love 'in Truth' means to love because of the Truth that abides in us, namely to love by means of the internal power of the Truth that abides in us⁷⁰. Therefore 'to worship in Truth' means that the Christian truth or the Revelation of Christ becomes for believers the internal source of their true worship of the Father. It is the worship that proceeds from the internal presence of the Truth of Christ, or from the fullness of faith in Christ.

The two-fold formula 'in Spirit and Truth' therefore indicates the two internal principles of Christian worship: the Spirit and Truth. But in Jn the Spirit is the Spirit of Truth⁷¹ who leads man into all Truth⁷². The role of the Spirit is to make the words

62) 1 Jn 1:5. 63) 1 Jn 4:8, 16. 64) Jn 3:3-8; 6:63.

65) Cf. 1 Jn 3:24; 4:1-6; 5:6. 66) Jn 3:8

67) Cf. 1 Jn 1:8, 10; Jn 17-17. 68) Jn 1:17; 14:6.

69) Jn 17:19; 2 Jn 1; 3 Jn 1. 70) Cf. also 1 Jn 3:18; 2 Jo 3.

71) Jn 14:17; 15:26; 16:13. 72) Jn 16:13.

of Christ efficaciously present in us. Hence the 'worship in Spirit and in Truth' is the worship that proceeds from the presence and permanence of the truth of Christ in us under the influence of the Spirit of Christ. Hence the new worship announced by Jesus is centered on the person of Christ and is essentially christological. Thus "Christ is shown to be the replacement for the old cultus and cult centre"⁷³.

The Synagogue

Another centre of worship to which we find a number of references in the N. T. is the Synagogue. Jewish tradition traced its origin back to the time of Moses or even the Patriarchs. Josephus says that Moses ordained that men should leave their other occupations once a week to listen to the Law⁷³ and this is generally understood to be a reference to the Synagogue. Philo similarly ascribed the beginnings of the Synagogue to Moses⁷⁵. Among the scholars, there is no unanimity as to the origin of the synagogues⁷⁶. Anyhow the Synagogue was established long before the Christian era. This is clear from the fact that in New Testament times synagogues were found throughout Palestine⁷⁷ and wherever Jewish communities were to be found⁷⁸.

73) Cf. B' Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*, Cambridge 1965, p. 119.

74) Cf. *Contra Ap.* 2, 17 (175)

75) Cf. *De Vita Mosis*, 2:39 (215f)

76) For a discussion on the various theories on the origin of the synagogue cf. H. H. Rolley, *Worship in Ancient Israel, Its Forms and Meanings*, London 1967, pp. 213-229.

77) The synagogues of Nazareth (Mt. 13:54; Mk. 6:2; Lk. 4:16) and Capernaum (Mk 1:21; Lk 7:5; Jn 6:59) are mentioned in the Gospels, and frequently Jesus is said to have taught or worked a miracle in a synagogue, where the place is unnamed, while Mk. 1:39 says he preached in all the synagogues throughout Galilee.

78) Of synagogues outside Palestine mentioned in the Acts we may note Damascus (9:20), Salamis (13:5) Antioch in Pisidia (13:14) Iconium (14:1), Philippi (16:13), Thessalonica (17:1), Berea (17:10), Athens (17:17), Corinth (18:4) and Ephesus (18:19; 19:8).

The officers of the synagogues were few and they are referred to in the NT. In Lk 7:3 we read that the Centurion sent the 'elders of the Jews' to Jesus, and from the sequel it would appear that they belonged to a particular synagogue, where they probably formed a body responsible for the management of the synagogue⁷⁹.

Another officer of the synagogue was the 'hazzan' who in Lk 4:20 is called the 'attendant'. He had to take care of the synagogue scrolls, the building and its furnishing. He also served as the officer of the synagogue court for the administration of punishment⁸⁰. Another person not mentioned in the New Testament was the 'sheli'ah' the 'sibbâr' or 'messenger of the community'⁸¹. He acted as the representative of the community and recited the prayers in the service.⁸²

This consisted of the 'Shema' prayer, the reading of the Law and the Prophets and the Blessing⁸³. The reading of the Prophets in New Testament times was probably not according to any fixed rule, and it may have been left to the choice of the reader or to that of the ruler of the synagogue or the 'hazzan.' We find Jesus reading the passage from Isaiah in the Synagogue of Nazareth⁸⁴. The reading of the Scripture might be followed by an exposition. It was at the invitation of the ruler of the synagogue that the address was given. So Jesus gave an address at Nazareth⁸⁵ and Paul and Silas at Antioch in Pisidia.⁸⁶

79) Cf. also Lk. 8:41 where Jairus is called 'a ruler of the synagogue' and Lk. 13:14 which speaks of the ruler of the synagogue who got indignant because of the healing done by Jesus on the Sabbath.

80) Cf. Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud and Midrash* IV part I, 1927, pp. 147 f.

81) Cf. Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., pp 149 f.

82) Cf. I Sonne, in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. IV, 1962, p. 490.

83) Cf. Mishna, Megillah, 4, 3 84) Lk. 4:18 f 85) Lk. 4:21 f.

86) Acts 13:15 f. 87) Cf. H. H. Rowley, *Israel's Mission to the World*, London 1939, pp, 123 f.

The worship in the synagogue was wholly spiritual. It was the place of the united outpouring of the spirit before God in prayer, the united attention to the Word of God, and the united acceptance of the claims of faith⁸⁷. Before the destruction of the Temple this great instrument of worship had been fashioned and it was the only instrument for large numbers of the Jews in the Diaspora.⁸⁸

Synagogue and Sabbath

The institution of Sabbath was preserved by the synagogue. In the synagogues the Sabbath was a day of resort for worship and prayer and the study of the Scriptures. Whatever its origin⁸⁹, the Sabbath took on a particular meaning which made it an institution peculiar to Israel. Its distinctive trait lies in the fact that it was a day made holy because of its relation to the God of the Covenant. It is an element in the Covenant. It became a day 'consecrated to Yahweh', a tithe on time. This is why a clause about the Sabbath appears in the various pacts inaugurating the Covenant.⁹⁰

Jesus fulfils and replaces the Sabbath

In New Testament times, the Pharisees forbade men to carry a bed⁹¹, to nurse a sick person⁹², to pick a few ears of corn⁹³ etc. Jesus did not condemn the Sabbath. He used to go Himself to the synagogue on Sabbath for worship⁹⁴. But He rejected the narrow-minded interpretations of the laws about it. He preached that the Sabbath obligation yielded to the precept of love of one's neighbour⁹⁵, that 'the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath'.⁹⁶

Jesus claimed also that 'the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath'⁹⁷. He could therefore abolish the Sabbath and he did

88) Cf. F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity* Vol. I, 1942 edn., p. 160.

89) About the origin of the Sabbath cf. R. De Vaux, *Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions*, London 1961, pp. 475-480.

90) Cf. R. De Vaux, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-148.

91) Jn 5:10 92) Mk. 3:2; Lk. 13:14 93) Mt. 12:2.

94) Cf. Lk 4:16; Mt. 24:20 95) Mk. 3:4; Lk. 13:15-16.

96) Mk. 2:27 97) Mk. 2:28

in fact do so, for the New Covenant which he brought abrogated the Old Covenant, of which the sabbath was the sign. The Christian Sunday is not in any sense a continuation of the Jewish Sabbath. If the Sabbath closed the week, the Christian Sunday opens the week in the new era by commemorating the Resurrection of Our Lord and by directing our attention to the future when He will come again. And yet Sunday does symbolize the fulfilment of those promises which the Sabbath foreshadowed. Like all the other promises of the Old Testament, these too are realized in the person of Christ, who fulfils the entire Law. Sunday is the 'Lord's Day', the day of Him who lightens our burdens⁹⁸ and through whom, with whom and in whom we enter into God's own rest⁹⁹.

Jesus and the feasts of the Jews

Annual days of observance were part of the Jewish worship in N.T. times. Thus we have the Feast of Lots (Purim)¹⁰⁰, Pass-over¹⁰¹, Pentecost¹⁰², and New Year¹⁰³, the Day of Atonement¹⁰⁴, of Tabernacles¹⁰⁵, of Dedication¹⁰⁶ etc. These feasts are not discussed nor are the details of the celebration of any of these feasts¹⁰⁷ gone into. In the Gospel of John we have a whole section speaking of Jesus in relation to the feasts of the Jews, namely chs. 5-10.

In ch. 5 Jesus justifies His work of healing on the Sabbath by calling the attention of the Jews to the fact that they admitted that God worked on the Sabbath: "My Father is working still and I am working" (v. 17). Making himself equal to God in doing the saving work on the Sabbath He shows that hereafter the Sabbath will be His day of giving life and judging; that it is a day pointing to the realized eschatology of salvation in him¹⁰⁸.

98) Mt. 11:28 99) Heb. 4:1-11 100) Esther 9:24 f

101) Mt. 26; Mk. 14; Lk. 22; Jn. 13.

102) Acts 2:1; 1 Cor 16:8; II Mach. 12:32 103) Lev. 16

104) Lev. 23:27-28; Acts 27:9 105) Jn. 7:2.

106) I Mach 4:56-59; II Mach 10:8; Jn. 10:22.

107) For a detailed study of these feasts cf. R. De Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 484-517.

108) Cf. Jn. 5:19-25

John's explicit introduction of the Passover theme in 6:4 seems to prepare us for the Eucharistic discourse that follows the multiplication. The discourse reflects several themes drawn from the synagogue readings at Passover time. These were taken from the Pentateuch¹⁰⁹ and the Prophets¹¹⁰. Now the Eucharistic discourse in Jn 6:35-50 is obviously centered around Exod 16 and also echoes the other Pentateuchal and Prophetic readings mentioned above¹¹¹. Even the form of the discourse seems to be patterned according to the homiletic form of Jewish preaching in Jesus' time¹¹². Thus John makes it clear that Jesus replaces the Jewish Passover celebration with the Eucharistic Memorial of his own.

In Jesus' time the Feast of the Tabernacles was especially sacred and important to the Jews¹¹³. Of particular importance were the ceremonies connected with the celebration of Tabernacles in Jerusalem¹¹⁴. The old agricultural background of Tabernacles, such as the autumnal harvest feast made it the occasion of prayers for rain. If rain fell during the celebration of the feast, it was looked on as an assurance of abundant early rains, which were necessary for fertile crops the following year. During the feast this was dramatized by a solemn ceremony. On each of the seven mornings of the feast-days a procession went down to the fountain of Gihon on the south-east side of the temple hill. There a priest filled a golden pitcher with water as the choir repeated Is 12:3 "With joy you will draw water from the wells of salvation". Then the procession went up to the Temple through the water-gate singing the Hallel Psalms 113-118. When they reached the altar of holocausts in front of the Temple, they proceeded around it singing Ps. 118:25. Then the priest went up to

109) Gen. 1-8; Exod 11-16 and Num 6-14.

110) Is 51:6 f. 54-55; 63:11 f. Cf. A. Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship. A study of the relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System*, Oxford 1960.

111) Cf. R. E. Brown, *op. cit.* p. 279.

112) Cf. P. Borgen, Observations on the Midrashic Character of John 6, *ZNW* 54 (1963) pp. 232-240.

113) Josephus, *Ant.* VIII, 4, 1. 114) See Str. Bill. II, pp. 774-812

the altar to pour the water into a silver funnel from where it flowed into the ground. ,

It was at this solemn moment in the ceremonies on the seventh day that Jesus stood up in the Temple court to proclaim solemnly that he was the source of the living water¹¹⁵. Their prayer for water had been answered in a way they did not expect; the promise of the Messiah that was contained in the feast had been fulfilled. Zech 14:8 had predicted that living waters would flow out of Jerusalem and Ez 47:1 had seen a river flow from the rock underneath the Temple. Both these texts are quoted by the Rabbinic texts in connection with the feast of the Tabernacles. Besides, in the Rabbinic commentaries about the libation at the feast of the Tabernacles, we see texts referring to three circumstances of the Old Testament: the original waters of Paradise, the rock of the desert, and the Temple that is the source of water. Now Jesus replaces the Temple and the ceremonies attached to it in connection with the feast of the Tabernacles. He proclaims himself to be 'the new Temple'¹¹⁶ from where the rivers of living water (the Holy Spirit) will flow and 'the spiritual Rock' from which all can drink¹¹⁷.

In the actual ceremonies of Tabernacles, there was another ritual of lighting four golden candiesticks in the Court of the Women. Each of these had four golden bowls on top¹¹⁸. Floating in these bowls were wicks and when they were lit, it is said that all Jerusalem reflected the light. It is standing in this part of the Temple that Jesus proclaimed that he was the Light, not only of Jerusalem, but of the whole world, namely that He was the life-giving light of Revelation.

The Feast of Dedication was the annual celebration of the reconsecration of the altar and Temple by Judas Machabeus after the driving out of the Syrians who profaned the Temple by erecting the idol of Baal Shamen on the altar of holocausts¹¹⁹. Now in this background Jesus proclaimed that he was the one who had truly been consecrated by God i.e. He was the new Tabernacle¹²⁰ and the new Temple¹²¹.

115) Jn. 7:37-39 116) Jn 2:20-22 117) Cf. 1 Cor 10:4.

118) Cf. Mishnah Sukkah 5-24.

119) Cf. 1 Mach 1: 54; 4:41-61; 2 Mach 6:1-7.

120) Jn 1:14 121) 2:21.

From all these facts we may conclude that Jesus' attitude towards the Jewish feasts was the same as his attitude towards the Law. He did not come to destroy them but to fulfil them. He went up to the Temple for the celebrating of the feasts and took part in them, But He wanted to show in Himself the fulfilment of those hopes and expectations occasioned by the feasts and by the Scriptural readings and ceremonies that accompanied them.

Conclusion

From the above analysis we come to see that the Mystery of Christ stands at the centre of NT worship and that the Jewish worship in its different forms of manifestation is fulfilled and replaced by it. Christ came at the 'fulness of time' and summed up the long history of salvation that had gone before Him. He is the key to the meaning of that history embodying God's redeeming love and eventually making it possible for men through Him to respond to God's love. In Christ we have the perfect achievement of our reconciliation with God and, therefore, in Him we have the fulness of divine worship.

St Thomas Ap. Seminary,
Kottayam-10

Mathew Vellanickal

Jesus, the High Priest of the New Law

Of the various NT writings it is the letter to the Hebrews that dwells in detail upon Christ's priesthood. Heb. exhibits a plan that is well thought out and serves to highlight its central theme: the author begins his discussions by introducing Jesus as the definitive messenger of God, a messenger who is far superior to angels and also to Moses (1:1-4:13). He then goes on to demonstrate, with the help of the Scriptures, the fact that Jesus is the high priest of the NT, and to describe the origin and nature of his priesthood (4:14-10:31). He brings his theological discourse to a close with the exhortation to hold fast to Jesus, the pioneer and perfecter of the faith (10:32-13:17). It is the purpose of this study to analyze the teaching of Heb. regarding Christ's position in the history of salvation as the high priest of the New Covenant.

It is evident that the author of Heb. did not intend to write a full and exhaustive "theology" of Christ's priesthood. But he puts before us, very emphatically, the person of the priest of the new alliance, his most essential act of worship, his sacrifice, its uniqueness and absoluteness, and its definitive and permanent effect. One is left with the impression that Heb. has very much spiritualized the concept of the priesthood, if we compare it with the OT figure of the priest and his work. Jesus, the incarnate Son of God, is the unique priest of eschatological times; he is shown as having been progressively elevated to it by his Resurrection and Ascension; through these events he reached achievement and perfection. This achievement-perfection is such that no other priest can or shall be, since no sacrifice is henceforth needed. Such, in brief, is the world of ideas of Heb.

To facilitate discussions here a list of texts is added, where explicit reference is made to Christ's priesthood: 3:1; 4:4-16; 5:1-10; 6:19f.; 7:1ff.; 8:1ff.; 9:1ff.; 10:1ff.; 12:24,28f.; 13:12-15,20f.

Christ's Divinity: the foundation of his priesthood

The high priest of our faith is superior to angels and Moses, for he is the Son of God, the splendour and image of God and, after his sacrifice, he has taken his seat for ever at the right hand of God. In fact, it is only in his capacity as Son that he is unchangeable (7:16), inaccessible to death (9:4), and all-powerful in intercession. In this sense his divine sonship is the foundation of his priesthood, for, as Spicq observes, from this "it receives all its dignity, efficacy, and permanence."¹

The message of Heb. is centred around Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the author of the new alliance, who is also man's brother (2:10ff. 5:7) and the high priest of the new economy of salvation. The author of Heb. exhorts his readers to be faithful to the heavenly gift and to the Holy Spirit who renders them sharers in the future life that will last for ever (6:4f.). The divine sonship of Jesus is thus a very important theme of Heb.

Priest by Incarnation

But Jesus is also man, and his activity as mediator and high priest is conditioned by this fact (3:15. 5:1-5. Cf. too 2:11-18). It is, then, not "as Son that Jesus is the priest, but in his capacity as God-Man."² Our Lord's priesthood commences at the moment of the incarnation, as is clear from the following passage: "...and this is what he said, on coming into the world 'You who wanted no sacrifice or oblation, prepared a body for me... then I said, just as I was commanded in the scroll of the book, God, here I am! I am coming to obey your will!! ...' (10:1-10).³ By what specific action of his has the incarnate Son of God exercised his priestly office?

Heb. presents Christ's death and resurrection as a sacrificial liturgy. Having shown that the cult of the OT was imperfect in many respects, the author goes on to describe Jesus the high priest who has penetrated once for all into the eternal

-
1. C. Spicq, *L'épître aux Hébreux I. Introduction* (Paris, 1952), pp. 287 ff.
 2. Spicq, *op. cit.*, pp. 291-96.
 3. All citations of biblical texts are from the Jerusalem Bible.

tabernacle, greater and perfect, as the Jewish one was not, since it is not of earthly creation. Shedding his blood, the incarnate Lord acquired for man an eternal redemption (9: 11f.), and this self-offering won for him entrance into the Holy of Holies of eternal glory.⁴

It is to be noted that not only death and glorification belong to Jesus' priestly liturgy, but everything in him is worship (vide 5: 7ff.). Surely, this priesthood of Christ had to be realized within the dimensions of human weakness, so that he could be a compassionate pontiff (2:17; 5:2), and hence "sanctifier and sanctified could all be one" (2: 11). His death opens the door to "beyond the veil" (10: 20) and communicates to this priesthood its achievement, its *teleiōsis*, i. e., its perfection.

Jesus' *teleiōsis* or achievement

This is a point on which Heb. lays great stress: "... after having been made perfect, he has become for all those who obey him the principle of eternal salvation, being greeted by God with the title of high priest in the order of Melchizedek" (5:7; 9: 10). The achievement in question has its own specific meaning which cannot be summed up very easily. One could say that it is the aptitude to enter the celestial sanctuary. Through his suffering, in obedience to God, on the Cross, Christ became perfect, that is, he accomplished his salvific mission here on earth, so that he is now the cause, the principle of salvation for mankind (2: 10, 5:9, 7:28). Death and glorification are vitally one in our Lord's *teleiōsis*: through his ascension he passes through the tent not made by man's hand and penetrates into the Holy of Holies, that is, the presence of God, to offer him the blood shed on the altar of the Cross.⁵ The result is that Christ has become the minister of the heavenly sanctuary.

The priestly dignity he now has is something far superior to that of the OT, i. e., the Levitical priesthood. This is due to

4. The Holy of Holies (as distinct from the Holy Place) was the most holy place in the temple where Yahweh was believed to dwell, and access was denied to all but the high priest.
5. Detailed discussion on the meaning of *teleiōsis* is in Spicq, *op. cit.*, II, *Commentaire* (Paris, 1953), pp. 214-25.

the fact that he has, by his death and resurrection, penetrated into the authentic sanctuary which is heaven itself, the abode of God and the archetype of the Jewish Temple (8:1-5. 9:11ff.) Jesus, the high priest, is furthermore the mediator of the New Covenant which now replaces the earlier one: "...he has been given a ministry of a far higher order, and to the same degree it is a better covenant of which he is the mediator, founded on better promises" (8: 6).

Eternal, holy priest

Through his resurrection and glorification Christ is in possession of an eternal priesthood; he is now the minister of the sanctuary and of the tent, the true one, the one dressed by the Lord, and not by man. The new sanctuary associated with Christ's priesthood is by its very nature spiritual; Heb. underlines, too, the essentially spiritual nature of Christ's *unique* priesthood. 7:26-28 gives the description of the ideal priest: "...the ideal high priest must be holy, innocent, and uncontaminated, beyond the influence of sinners, and raised up above the heavens; one who would not need to offer sacrifices every day, as the other high priests do for their own sins and for those of the people, because he has done this once for all by offering himself. The Law appoints high priests who are men subject to weakness; but the promise on oath, which came after the Law, appointed the Son who is made perfect for ever."

Indeed, God has made an oath which he will never modify or change: "You are a priest for ever" (7:21). Once again the writer accentuates Jesus' superiority over the priest of the OT: there were many priests in the OT because they were subject to death, but Jesus has an unchangeable priesthood because he remains for ever. Hence he is capable of saving in a definitive manner all those who, through him, approach God, and he always lives to make intercession for them (7:23f).

To sum up, Heb. repeats more than once that Christ has once for all entered the Holy of Holies where his priestly ministry blossoms to its full maturity. inaugurated as it is by the Incarnation, and consummated in the sacrifice of the Cross. He achieves perfection through his resurrection and ascension into heaven where "having accomplished the purification of sins, he

is "seated at the right of the majesty on high" (1:3f.) and is "always living to intercede in our favour" (7:25), for he is a minister of the eternal sanctuary. We must not fancy that Christ is shedding his blood anew or that he is offering his blood once again as a second heavenly sacrifice. There is only the continuation, in its achievement of the self-same sacrifice offered on Calvary: the blood shed on Calvary is offered to the Father. This permanent, eternal offering is the ministry of the celestial high priest; it is the heavenly liturgy, the saving and sanctifying liturgy. "The sacrifice is perfect, eternal from the moment of oblation, is actual, or better, it subsists, unchangeable, from the death on the cross onwards."⁶

Priest in the tradition of Melchizedek

Heb. avows that Christ, not being a member of the tribe of Levi, could not lay claim to being a priest (7:13f.). However the writer enumerates the conditions required of one who would be a priest: "No one takes this honour (= priestly dignity) on himself, but each one is called by God, as Aaron was. Nor did Christ give himself the glory of becoming high priest, but he had it from the one who said to him... 'You are a priest of the order of Melchizedek, for ever' (5:4ff.). Heb. thus underlines the divine origin of Christ's priesthood: he is called by God by an eternal oath. This point is demonstrated by a spiritual interpretation of Pss. 2 and 110 which the earlier tradition of the Church had already applied to the risen and glorified Lord.

The appointment as high priest was granted by God who said to Christ: "You are my son, today I have become your father" (8:5). The writer's exegesis is truly subtle, for he establishes the divine origin and eternity of Christ's priesthood by combining Ps. 2. with story in Gen. 14. The implication of this combination is that Jesus the priest is also the Messiah-King: like Melchizedek of old he is both priest and king. The ruler of Jerusalem was a man whose father, mother, ancestry and the beginning and ending of life are not mentioned in the OT, and as such "he is like the Son of God" (7:3). In other words, he is

6. Spicq, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 304-9.

a figure of Jesus, the Son of God, and as Son of God our Lord "remains a priest for ever" (7:3).

The author also takes care to demonstrate Melchizedek's superiority over the Levitical priests. Abraham gave tithes to the priest-king who for his part also blessed the patriarch. "Now it is indisputable that a blessing is given by a superior to an inferior" (7:7). Moreover, when Abraham gave tithes, Levi, the ancestor of the priests of the OT, was himself doing the thing (7:8-10), which means to say that he was making an avowal of the fact that the priest-king's sacerdotal dignity was far superior to his own.

The investiture as priest that Christ received from God is inamissible, perpetual, unchangeable; hence he remains a priest for ever (7:24). In addition, the emergence of the new priest according to the tradition of Melchizedek has brought about the abolition of the Old Law for reason of its weakness and inutility; since it brings nothing to perfection, it has been replaced by something better (7:18f.).

The author of Heb. is never 'tired of insisting on the abolition of the NT priesthood. The sacrifice of Christ is far superior to all the sacrifices of the OT, and, like his priesthood, it displaces and replaces the various offerings of the earlier dispensation. All these offerings have been abrogated because of their inadequacy: then there is also the fact of the new sacrifice's eminent dignity and value. In short, the sacrifice of the high priest according to the order of Melchizedek is unique in every respect, and it is to be sharply distinguished from the Levitical priesthood of the OT.

"Once for all"

Another reason for the superiority of the new priesthood is the fact that Christ's offering took place once for all, without any need of repetition, or multiplication of offerings as in the OT. "And he does not have to offer himself again and again, like the high priest going into the sanctuary year after year... Instead of that, he has made his appearance once and for all... to do away with sin by sacrificing himself" (9:25f.) Christ "offers himself only once to take away the faults of many on himself,

and when he appears a second time, it will not be to deal with sin but to reward with salvation those who are waiting for him" (9:28).

The sacrifice has, then, been offered to God once for all. This "once" is something absolute in Heb., for it grants to Christ's sacrifice and to the salvation it merits an absolute value.

Christ has therefore inaugurated a new cult, a new liturgy. Heb. views the whole economy of the OT as an announcement of, and preparation for, the new order of divine worship whose centre is the death and resurrection of Christ. The writer calls the OT dispensation a *parable* (9:9), i. e., an obscure announcement of the new order of cult brought into being by Christ. He dwells with predilection on the excellence of this new cult exercised by Christ in heaven. But this purpose is just to characterize this new economy of salvation as the final and definitive one. According to him the special position Jesus occupies in this new order is that of the high priest, and in his treatise the Lord's priesthood has the same significance as his death and resurrection in Pauline theology.

The "better" covenant

As is clear from what has been said, so far Christ's consecration as high priest and his sacrifice mark the abolition of the Jewish priesthood and the inauguration of a new type of it; in other words, through his sacrifice Christ has established the new alliance or Covenant between God and man which is far superior to the old, ratified through Moses. It is significant that the qualification *better* occurs 13 times in Heb., and invariably it points to the superiority of the new dispensation over the old (cf. 8:8 ff. 9:15 ff. 10:11 ff. 12:18 ff.).

The efficacy of the better covenant which cancels the offerings of the old dispensation is proved by Heb. with an appeal to the LXX text of Ps. 40:6-8: "You who wanted no sacrifice or oblation prepared a body for me..." (10:5 ff.) The writer here takes his stand in the long line of prophets who used to reproach the Israelites for their lack of sincerity; they multiplied sacrifices but forgot the law of God, i. e., his salvific will as **made known**

through the Covenant stipulation. Now in the case of Christ's sacrifice, what makes it so pleasing to God and efficacious is the element of obedience. Heb. is in full agreement with Paul who tells the Philippians how the Son of God emptied himself and became obedient, obedient even to death on the Cross (2:6). And this obedience, this sacrifice of our high priest implied not only his death and glorification but also all his acts of prayer, entreaty, tears, etc., and, let us also note, all acts of kindness to his brethren (cf. 13:16).

Such, then, is the sacrifice of the better dispensation, offered by Christ in the course of his whole life but perfected in his death and ascension, and in heaven he continues to offer it to God (7:25). Christians have a part in it when they gather round the new altar (13:10). In this text we seem to have an allusion to the Christian celebration. The idea of the sacrifice of the new order is predominant in 13:8-14 (cf. too vv. 15 f.). Heb. also speaks of the sacrifice which in concrete is prayer, "the sacrifice of lips", as the writer calls it (13:15). The practice of charity (13:16), and the confession of one's faith (13:15) are also seen as part of the new and better covenant inaugurated by Jesus.

Jesus the high priest as forerunner, prophet and shepherd

A special title that Heb. predicates of Jesus is *prodromos* (6:20), forerunner, the one who has preceded us into the celestial sanctuary. To understand the author's reasoning we have to recall that entrance into the Holy of Holies was restricted to the high priest alone (Lev. 16:2), and Jesus, the high priest of the NT, by penetrating into the inner sanctuary, has laid open to all who come after him the way to God's abode. In this sense he is our leader who goes ahead of us;

Our Lord is again the prophet *par excellence*; he is the definitive messenger of God: "At various times in the past and in various different ways, God spoke to our ancestors through the prophets; but in our own time, the last days, he has spoken to us through his Son" (1:1 f.).

Finally he is the shepherd. We read in the epilogue: God "brought our Lord back from the dead to become the great

shepherd of the sheep by the blood that sealed an eternal covenant..." (13:20) In conclusion, whatever may have been the the writer's reasons to focus his entire attention on Christ's position as the high priest of the new dispensation, he is certainly aware that the Lord is more than just that. The historical person of Jesus of Nazareth, who, to the eyes of faith, is the incarnate Son of God, through his suffering, death and resurrection, performed the integral ministry of prophet, shepherd and priest and preceded us into the celestial sanctuary as our guide and leader⁷.

The teaching of Heb. regarding Christ's priesthood has been synthesized in the preceding pages. The historical person of Jesus of Nazareth, the God-Man, is the high priest of the NT; he is a priest in virtue of a special call from God, and his priestly dignity accrues to him through his suffering and glorification. The risen and glorified One has penetrated the heavenly sanctuary where he is offering worship to God. The sacrifice he offered here on earth is once for all, and it is the basis of the new and better covenant; it has indeed cancelled the old covenant. Such, in short, are some of the basic ideas of Heb.

Heb. has profound bearing upon our liturgical life. In the NT there is only one priest, namely, Jesus, and all Christians without exception have a true, real and genuine, though mysterious, sharing in his priesthood. Together with him, the entire community of God's people in the NT offers him a cult in and through the actual performance of what we call Christian liturgy. It is true that in the Church the celebration of the liturgy is carried on by "ordained" priests, but ordination, according to many modern theologians, is something purely functional: since the community as a whole cannot exercise the ministry, a few men are specially entrusted with the discharge of this specific function

7. Other NT writings too refer, though not so explicitly as Heb., to Christ's priestly dignity; thus Jn. 17 represents him as exercising the priestly function of intercessory prayer. In the Pauline corpus there are veiled references to the work of redemption as a liturgico-priestly function, e. g., "Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed" (1 Cor. 5:7).

In other words, the whole body of believers acts, together with their high priest Jesus, as the ministrant of Christian liturgy.

The worthy exercise of the universal priesthood of the faithful is impossible without suffering: this is a conclusion that immediately follows from what Heb. has to say about the achievement of Jesus. Our Lord became the high priest of the NT through suffering, and the faithful too, in so far as they are sharers in his priesthood, are bound to taste his cup of bitterness. The sufferings they have to endure are the ones necessarily implied in their endeavour to live the Christian life in all its fullness. The genuine celebration of the liturgy is, then, impossible without authentic Christian life which brings in its train pain and suffering. By bravely facing them we hold fast to our confession of faith in Jesus, and, with him, hasten to enter into the presence of God where he, as our *prodromos* or forerunner, has preceded us.

St Joseph's Pontifical Seminary
Always-3

Bernard Brys

Ārādhana :

A Lexicographical Study

Though the word *ārādhana* is used by Christians all over India¹, the rich variety of meanings it has in Indian tradition remains unfortunately unknown. Of course, we all know that the term is borrowed from Sanskrit, but what many of us may not be cognizant of is the fact that it is ultimately derived from an Indo-European (abbr. IE) base which survives not only in Sanskrit but also in some other languages of the IE family. The present investigation is a modest endeavour to bring out the full meaning of *ārādhana* in the light of the rich information we obtain from comparative philology; it is a lexicographical study, in the sense that it will concentrate on the meanings the base of our term has in early Indian tradition as represented by the *R̥gveda* (abbr. RV), the oldest literary monument of India and the fountainhead of later religious thought². By way of conclusion an attempt will be made to show how appropriate the word under study is to bring out the Christian concept of divine worship.

I

From the grammatical point of view the noun *ārādhana*³ consists of the prefix *ār-*, the base *rādh-* (which can itself be

1. Cf. J. S. M. Hooper, *Greek New Testament Terms in Indian Languages* (Bangalore, 1957), pp. 118f.
2. The edition of the RV utilized in this essay is T. Aufrecht, *Die Hymnen des Rigveda*, I-II (4th ed., Wiesbaden, 1968). K. F. Geldner, *Der Rig-Veda*, I-III (Harvard Oriental Series 33-35, Harvard, 1951) has been of great help; so too A. Bergaigne, *La religion védique d'après les hymnes du Rig-Veda*, I-III *Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études*. IVE section - *sciences historiques et philologiques*, fasc. 36, 53-54, repr., Paris, 1963).
3. Cf. A. Thumb-R. Hauschild, *Handbuch des Sanskrit*, II (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Erste Reihe: Lehr- und Handbücher. 2nd ed., Heidelberg, 1953), p. 183.

split into the stem *rā-* and the extensional element *-dh-*), and the suffix *-ana*. As was noted in a previous article published in this review⁴, an IE noun is generally made up of a root, stem or base, a suffix, and a case-ending which may at times be zero; in the same study it has also been pointed out that IE roots can take prefixes as well. The structure of *ārādhana-* is a genuinely IE one, and it now remains for us to examine the various component elements.

Let us start with the first element, its origin and significance. Since from the historical point of view, the Sanskrit vowel *a*, irrespective of its quantity, can represent the vowels *e* and *o* of the parent-language⁵, it follows that the prefix in *ārādhana-* can be derived either from *ē* or *ō*⁶. Both these vowels have, as a matter of fact, been preserved in Greek; as examples of short *e* and *o* we may cite *e-thelō*⁷, "to wish, will", *e-geirō*, "to awaken", and *o-kellō*, "to run a ship ashore". The long vowels occur in *ē-baios*⁸, "little, small, slight, poor," *ō-ruomai*⁹, "to howl" (of wolves and dogs), and *ō-chros*¹⁰, "yellow-coloured, pale of complexion, ochre".

4. Cf. "The Term Prārthana: its Meaning", *Jeevadhara* 2 (1972) pp. 183 f.
5. It may be noted here that these are the two basic vowels of the parent IE language; compare their alternation in Latin *tegō*: *toga*, in Greek *legō*: *logos*, *leipō*: *leloipa*, *drekō*: *dedroka*, etc.
6. Cf. A Thumb-R. Hauschild, *Handbuch des Sanskrit*, I/2 (3rd ed., Heidelberg, 1959), § 659 (p. 390).
7. Attested too is *thelō*, with the same meaning.
8. There is too the alternate form *baios* without any difference in meaning.
9. In Sanskrit there is *ā-ru-*, "to shout or cry towards, cry out; to praise; to roar towards or against" (this last sense occurs in the RV). The base *ru-* is a root created in imitation of sounds heard in nature, and it survives in Latin *rū-mor*, etc.
10. Compare Sanskrit *ā-nīla*, "of *nīla* (= indigo) colour".

Iranian tradition attests the prefix \bar{a} -¹¹; thus from Avestan, the language of the Zarathushtrian scriptures, \bar{a} - $\bar{d}\bar{a}$ na- (= Sanskrit \bar{a} - $\bar{d}\bar{a}$ na-) may be cited: "taking, receipt, paying back"¹², \bar{a} - \bar{t} hri-tim, "three times", \bar{a} - \bar{v} arena-, "confession of faith," \bar{a} - \bar{s} nā-, "successful, active", etc. Old Persian, the language of the inscriptions of the Achaemenian emperors (550-330 B.C.) too preserves the same tradition: e. g., \bar{a} - \bar{v} ahana-¹³, "settlement, locality", \bar{a} - \bar{y} adana-¹⁴, "consecrated place, sanctuary", etc.

As for Sanskrit,¹⁵ \bar{a} - is an adverbial preposition meaning "on, in, at, to", etc.: when used with the accusative case, it means "to", pointing to the goal in the case of verbs of motion; when followed by the ablative case, the sense is "from, on," but when the case precedes it, it acquires the meaning "up to"; finally when prefixed to verbs denoting the action of going or giving, it has the power to reverse the sense: thus, \bar{g} am-, "to go", but \bar{a} - \bar{g} am-, "to come," \bar{d} ā-, "to give", but \bar{a} - \bar{d} ā-, "to take", etc. As examples of nouns which in some way or other imply a movement to a term we may cite \bar{a} - \bar{k} aṣṇa-, "attraction", \bar{a} - \bar{k} alana-, "trying up", and \bar{a} - \bar{h} vana-, "call"; the term under scrutiny, we say, belongs to the group of forms just cited.

The base $r\bar{a}dh$ -¹⁶, as has already been noted, is made up of the IE root-element $r\bar{e}$ - and the extensional suffix $-dh$ -, both

11. There are copious examples in C. Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (repr., Berlin, 1964).
12. The base is $\bar{d}\bar{a}$ - which goes back to IE $\bar{d}\bar{o}$ - (cf. Latin $\bar{d}\bar{o}$, Greek $\bar{d}\bar{i}$ $\bar{d}\bar{o}$ -mi = Sanskrit $\bar{d}\bar{a}$ - $\bar{d}\bar{a}$ -mi); $\bar{d}\bar{a}$ na- is a noun created with the help of the suffix $-na$ (IE $-no$), corresponding to Latin $\bar{d}\bar{o}$ num; in the case of \bar{a} - $\bar{d}\bar{a}$ na- the prefix serves to reverse the sense.
13. In Sanskrit the equivalent is \bar{a} \bar{v} asana-, from the base \bar{a} - \bar{v} as-, "to abide, dwell"; the change of Aryan s to h in Iranian has given rise to the form cited in the text.
14. Compare Sanskrit \bar{d} evayajana-, "place of offering". Iranian \bar{y} ad-, "to adore, venerate" has its equivalent in Sanskrit \bar{y} aj- (Greek \bar{h} agios, "holy", etc.).
15. J. Wackernagel - A. Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik*, II/1 (repr., Göttingen, 1954), § 119 (pp. 312f.).
16. Detailed list of correspondences in J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I (Bern, 1959), pp. 59f.

of which survive in some of the languages of the IE family, and an examination of them will certainly serve to clarify the meaning of *rādh-* in Sanskrit. The stem *rē-* occurs in Latin *reor*, "to think, suppose", in the participle *pa-tus*, "fixed, settled" (ratified), and in the noun *ra-tio*, "reckoning, account, reason"; we must add here too Gothic *ga-rath-ana* (participle of *ga-rath-jan*, "to pay"), Old Norse *hund-rad*, English *hundred*, etc., where *-rad* (*-red*) corresponds to Latin *ratum*, Gothic *rath-jō*, "reckoning, account."

Much more frequent, however, is the extended stem *rēdh-* which, as a result of vowel gradation¹⁷, appears also as *rōdh-*, and which, together with the formations arising from it, occurs in a number of IE languages. In Avestan, for instance, we come across the verb *rādaiti*, "makes ready, prepares", and the nouns *rāda*, "caretaker, one who provides for," and *rādah* (neut.), "willingness, readiness" (with reference to religious duties or activities). The base survives in Old Persian (*avahya*) *rādi*, "on account of (that)",¹⁸ which is in point of fact a locative singular and corresponds to Old Slavic (*togo*) *radī*. It is worth adding here the Modern Persian *ārāyad*, *ārāstan*, "to adorn."

The base with the vowel *ō* is preserved in Gothic *rōd-jan* (from *rōdheyō* which is a causative-iterative form), "to speak". The base with *ē* also is attested in Germanic; e. g., Gothic *ga-rēdan*, "to reflect upon", *und-rēdan*, "to provide, furnish, grant", *ur-rēdan*, "to provide", Old High German *rā-tan*, "to give advice", Anglo-Saxon *rādan* (the same), Old English *rāēdan* which survives in Modern English *read*, etc.

17. This phenomenon is also known as apophony (a designation preferred by French scholars) or ablaut (the term used by German scholars). For a few examples, cf. n. 5 above. The fact that *e* and *o* have coalesced into *a* in the Aryan dialects has tended to obscure the process of vowel gradation in Sanskrit.

18. Cf. H. Jensen, *Nuepersische Grammatik mit Berücksichtigung der historischen Entwicklung* (Indogermanische Bibliothek. I. Reihe: Grammatiken, Bd. 22, Heidelberg, 1931), § 59 (p. 46).

Reverting now to Sanskrit, it should be emphasized, in the first place, that *rādh-* is used both with and without prepositional prefixes. The following is a list of prefixal forms which give an idea of the rich and varied nuances accruing to our root: *apa-rādh-*, "to miss the mark, offend against", *ava-rādh-*, "to fail, miscarry", *abhi-rādh-*, "to propitiate", *upa-ā-radh-*, "to serve someone", *sam-ā-rādh-*, "to propitiate, satisfy, gain the affection of". A discussion of the non-prefixal form is not necessary, as the second part of the present study is a detailed investigation of *rādh-* and its use in the first Veda.

The last element in *ārādhana-* is the ending *-ana* which is one of the primary suffixes in Sanskrit, i.e., one that is added immediately to the root,¹⁹ and goes back to IE *-eno ono-*²⁰. This suffix serves to create action and agent nouns, and whereas it is quite productive as an element of word-formation in Indo-Iranian, Germanic and Balto-Slavic, it is employed only to a very limited extent in Greek, Italic and Celtic. The *-eno* form occurs, for example, in *phér-ena* (= Sanskrit *bhár-aṇa-*) and the *-ono* form in *hed-onē*, "pleasure", *anch-onē*, *anch-ónē*, "strangulation, throttling", *per-óne*, "brooch, clasp" and *sphend-óne*, "sling, hoop of a ring, stone in the sling". From Iranian we may adduce *hav-ána-*, lit. "presser" (a utensil used in the pressing of the sacred drink soma), *drauj-ána-*, "lying, liar", *ham-áranam* (= Sanskrit *sam-ar-aṇa-m*), "battle", *zāv-anəm* (= Sanskrit *háv-anam*), "invocation", etc. Numerous examples of abstract (or action) and participial (or agent) nouns are furnished by Sanskrit, from which we cite the following: *vah-ána-s*, "that which moves, vehicle", *váh-ana-m*, "the act of moving", *vart-ána-s*, "what causes to turn", *várt-ana-m*, "turning". Compare too *ján-ána-s*, "begetter", *ján-ana-m*, "begetting", *táp-ána-s*, "troubling", *doh-ána-s*, "milking", *vac-ána-s*, "ready to talk", *rác-ana-m*,

19. These are to be distinguished from secondary suffixes which are added to stems ending in a suffix and to pronominal roots (which are thus regarded as primary stems). Exhaustive discussions are found in Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik*. II/2. *Die Nominalsuffixe* (Göttingen, 1954).
20. K. Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, II/1 (repr., Berlin, 1967), § 184 (pp. 266ff.).

“ordering, arranging”, *ā-d-ana-m*, “eating”, etc. These few examples, it is hoped, will clarify the role the suffix *-ana* has vis-à-vis the term under consideration.

Here, now, is a list of the principal meanings the word *ārādhana-* in Indian tradition:²¹

- (1) *ārādhana-s* (masculine) = “propitiating, rendering favourable to oneself”;
- (2) *ārādhana-m* (neuter) = “gratifying, propitiation, homage, worship, adoration; acquirement, attainment; cooking”;²²
- (3) *ārādhana* (feminine)²³ = “worship, adoration, propitiation of deities”.

A special meaning *ārādhana-* has in classical tradition – a tradition which has been permeated through and through by bhakti spirituality – is best attested by the Bhagavad Gītā:

*‘a tayā śradhayā yuktas tasy’ārādhanam īhate
labhate ca tatah kāmān may’aiva vihitān hi tāt*
“He, disciplined with that faith,²⁴

21. All the major dictionaries of Sanskrit include lists of meanings and succinct references to sources; cf., for example, M. Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (repr., Oxford, 1970), p. 150.
22. Sanskrit attests the word *raddhanna-*, “dressed food”. The word consists of the passive participle *rāddha-* (formed from *rādh-* + *-ta*, which, according to the rules of sandhi, will give rise to the form cited) and the noun *anna*, “food”.
23. In Sanskrit the feminine form of words can be formed by lengthening the final vowel; e.g., *bāla-*, “boy, but *bālā-*, “girl.”
24. The Sanskrit word here rendered as ‘faith’ is *śradhā-*, which goes back to *k’red-dhē-*, lit. “to put (set) one’s heart upon”, and is related to Latin *credō*, Old Irish *cretim*, etc. From the etymological point of view faith or *śradhā-* is, then, the setting of one’s heart upon God who reveals himself. For a summary of discussions, cf. R. Schmidt, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in Indogermanischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden, 1967), §§ 444-451 (pp. 216-19).

Seeks to propitiate that (divine being),
 And obtains therefrom his desires,
 Because I myself ordain them" (7: 22).²⁵

This may be paraphrased as: the individual who is a firm believer in his god offers him *ārādhana-* and obtains from him his desires: such is the ordinance of Kṛṣṇa. Needless to say, we have here a concept of *ārādhana-* which comes very close to the Christian one.

We shall bring this section to a close with a brief mention of some other formations from *ārādh-* which will highlight the basic sense of *ārādhana-* outlined above. There is, first of all, the verbal root *ārādh-* whose causative form, viz. *ārādhayati*²⁶, means "conciliates, propitiates, obtains the favour of, gains a boon from; honours, worships; deserves, merits." The passive form *ārādhyate* too is attested, but its sense ("be effected, accomplished") is not of any importance for our investigation. The next formation to be considered is *ārādhanīya-*, "to be worshipped, adored; to be propitiated, conciliated." There are also *ārādhyā-* and *ārādhaya-*, "to be made favourable; to be worshipped; to be accomplished", and *ārādhita* "propitiated, pleased, solicited for a boon; worshipped, honoured, revered; accomplished, effected." The last form now adduced is *ārādhayamāna-*, "being worshipped, receiving worship; being in the course of fulfilment, being accomplished." Thus *ārādhana* is a term that is quite rich in nuances.

II

Let us now pass on to the RV and see what the sages of the Vedic period meant when they used the base *rādh-* in their poetical compositions. For those who may not be acquainted with the text of the first Veda it may be pointed out here that it never employs the noun we are studying, nor does it use the verbal stem *ārādh-*. When it wishes to convey the idea of what we call

25. F. E. Edgerton, *The Bhagavad Gītā* (Harper Torchbooks, New York, 1964), p. 40.

26. The causative stem is formed by adding the ending *-aya-* (which is the Aryan form of IE *eyo-*) to the verbal root; e. g., *vid-*, "to know", but *vedayāmi*, "I cause to know, instruct."

worship, it uses the base *nam-*²⁷, "to bow, bend, respect, venerate." Moreover, the verbal base *rādh-* is quite rare in the RV, and even noun form *rādha-*, though much more frequent than the verb, is a relatively rare term, but despite all this the expressions are all pregnant with meaning and shed light on several aspects of Vedic man's religious life and thought.

We begin our investigation with a form that commences with the privative particle *a-*, viz, *a-rādha-s*, "one who does not bring offerings to the gods, one who is impious, covetous." This epithet is applied to the Paṇis,²⁸ the foes of the Aryans (8:64:2). as well as to *marta-*, "mortal man" (1:84:8. Cf. 5:61:6. 9:101:13. 10:32:2. 10:60:6). As antonym to this appellation there is *su-rādha-s*, "giving good gifts, generous, liberal." The gods Indra and Agni (3:13:8. 4:2:4. 4:5:4. Cf. 8:14:12. 8:88:6), for example, are depicted as lavish givers of gifts. In one text (1:23:6) Mitra and Varuṇa are requested to come to the worshippers' aid and make them *surādhasas*, i. e., richly and generously rewarded. According to another passage the poets of the Viśvāmitra family who have composed a poem in honour of Indra request him to bestow upon them, as a reward for their labour, favours in abundance, i. e., to render them *surādhasas* (3:53:13). Inasmuch as the gods are the source of all blessings and favours, any god can be addressed as *surādhas*, and this conviction has ultimately been responsible for the different prayers for *rādhas* in the RV.

Let us now pass on to a study of the meanings the noun *rādhas* has in the RV. Lexicographers distinguish some six

-
27. The common Indian salutation *namaste* the expression *namas-kāram* (cf. the greeting in Telugu *namaskāram-andi*), etc. go back to this root, which for its part represents IE *nem-*; this base probably survives in Latin *nemus*, "sacred grove", Greek *nemos*, and Old Irish *nemed*, "sanctuary in the wilderness."
 28. These are a special group of the pre-Aryan inhabitants of India. Some of the Paṇis were friendly to the invaders while the majority remained hostile to them, and this historical fact explains the representation of this particular section of the indigenous population as an impious lot.

different senses:²⁹ (1) "liberality, generosity in giving"; (2) "gift, present, a gift actually, or to be given"; (3) "gift", with the giver in the genitive (4) or with a qualification describing the gift; (5) "offering"; (6) homage, willingness to give (gifts)." In what follows a few texts will be examined that serve to bring out the meanings here listed.

The idea of "generous, liberal giving" is in the fore in the following passages. A poet tells Indra and Varuṇa that he invokes (*aham huve* = "I invoke") them *citrāya*³⁰ *rādhase* (1:17:7): for a spectacular bestowal of gifts on him. Another writer makes use of quite striking image as he enunciates his thought: Indra should come with all speed riding upon his steeds *avase rādhase ca* (4:20:2), to the worshipper's aid and with *rādhās*. The sages are convinced that a good drink of soma will render Indra quite generous. Moved by this persuasion a poet addresses Indra as *śūra-*, "hero," and asks him to intoxicate himself (*mādayasva*) with soma *rādhase* (1:81:8), in order to grant favours liberally. The connection between the strong sacred beverage and generosity in giving is brought out elsewhere too. Thus the author of 1:139:6 wishes that soma drinks intoxicate (*madantu*) Indra *citrāyā rādhase*, so that he may generously bestow favours. The same line of thought is expressed by another poet: Indra should get drunk with some *rādhase tamā mahe* (3:41:6), so that he may be most lavish in giving. Finally 3:51:12 may also be mentioned, where the wish is expressed that the soma drinks penetrate into Indra's sides, head and hands so as to move him to generosity (*rādhase*).

The above expressions may sound somewhat crude but there are other thoughts which are really sublime. For example, of

29. H. Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rigveda* (4th ed., Wiesbaden, 1964), cols. 1161f.

30. Lit. "excellent, bright, variegated." The Sanskrit form is created by the addition of the ending *-tra* (IE *-tro*) which serve to produce adjectives as well as nouns (Thumb-Hauschild, *op. cit.*, 1, 2, § 254e [p. 41]). The IE base of this word attests two forms, one with *s*, viz. *skai-* and another without it, namely, *kai-*; the former survives in Lithuanian *skaidrūs*, *skàidrus*, *skàistas*, etc.

Uṣas³¹ it is said that *devam rādhase codayanti* (7:79:5); she prompts every god to liberality³². The following statement addressed to Indra is really touching: "You are to me more than a father and brother. You and the mother seem to me alike *vasutvanāya rādhase* (8:1:6) in the matter of goodness and generosity." The close connection between the singing of the praises of the gods and their liberality towards the worshipper is never lost sight of in the RV. A poet asks: "What song (*kā suṣṭutiḥ*) will prompt Indra, the benevolent one, to generosity *rādhasa ā vavartat*; 4:24:1?" The singers feel too that their songs which, of course, tend to glorify the gods, serve as well to increase their liberality in giving, *vardhanti mahe rādhase* (8:2:29).

There are several passages in which the noun in question occurs in conjunction with a verb which conveys the idea of giving. In other words, it has become synonymous with gift. There are first of all texts in which derivatives of the root *dā-*, "to give"³³, are used. Indra, for instance, is said to stand by the singer, conferring upon him the object of his desire, *dātā rādha* (2:22:3). "To Savitar the wish is expressed: to us (*asmābhyam*) there should come (*ā gāt*) from heaven, from water and from the earth, as your gift the good we desire, *twayā dattam kāmīyam rādha* (2:38:11)." The next verb we have to consider is *bhar-*, "to bear, carry, bring;"³⁴ reference is made in 5:39:1 to Indra's bringing gifts in both his hands, *rādhas ... ubhayāhasty ā bhara*, and in 7:81:5 Uṣas is requested to bring excellent gifts, *citram rādha ā bharoṣo*. A third verb that belongs here is *dhā-*, "to put,

31. That is, *aurora* (from the earlier form *ausosa*), "dawn."

32. The verb *codayanti* is the third person plural, the subject being the beams of light that announce the coming of dawn. The line under consideration begins thus: *devam-devam...* This repetition of the same word gives an intensive or distributive sense to the phrase; compare *dive-dive*, "from day to day", *pade-pade*, "step by step", *vayam-vayam*, "our very selves", etc.

33. Cf. n. 12 above. The expression *rādho-deya-*, "giving of gifts", occurring twice in the RV (4:51:3. 8:4:4), is also noteworthy.

34. Same as Latin *ferō*, Greek *pherō*, etc.,

place, set.”³⁵ The Maruts are requested to grant (*dhattana*) the *rādhas* for which the poets have been praying (5:53:13). Similarly Uṣas should bring (*dadhati*) *rādhas* consisting of cattle, horses and a chariot (7:77:5). A similar petition is addressed also to the Aśvins (8:8:13). There are also verbs such as *nī-*, “to lead”, *vah-*,³⁶ “to carry”, etc. in conjunction with which our noun is used by the Vedic poets, but a survey of all the passages is not possible here. It is enough to say that the gods can prompt their fellow-gods to grant favours to pious folk (see above 7:79:5).

In another series of texts *rādhas* is coupled with its source, which concretely may be the gods or prominent groups of the Aryan tribes like the Yādus³⁷ (8:6:46), or even mighty and influential leaders like Divodasa, son of Atithigva (6:47:22), but as we are not here concerned with the granting of favours by men an examination of these passages is not necessary. Coming to the world of the gods, we find that Savitar can be the bestower of *rādhas*: “We will today think (*mānamate*) of this desirable gift of Savitar, *taḍ rādho adya savitur* (1:159:5). We have already seen how in Indra’s case soma and liberality are closely related, and this connection stands in the rear of the petition to Soma to become clarified *indrasya rādhasse* in view of Indra’s *rādhas* (9:60:4). The following statement, occurring in a text where the poet makes the confession that Indra is in possession of all good, is quite noteworthy: *bhaksīya tava rādhasaḥ* (1:81:6), “I wish to become a sharer in your *rādhas*.”

In a few passages the poets describe the favour which is the object of their yearning. In 5:52:17, which is a short *dānas-tuti*,³⁸ the Maruts are praised as givers of *rādho gavyam* and *rādho aśvyam*, cows and horses as *rādhas*. The idea that these animals, on which the Aryans depended so much for their liveli-

35. The IE base of this verbal root survives in Latin *fe-* (cf. *fē-ci*), in Greek *thē-* (cf. *tī-thē-mi*), etc.

36. Related to Latin *vehō*.

37. These are a tribe of the Vedic age who are sometimes praised in the RV but are, at other times, reproached. It is not clear whether they are the ancestors of the Yādavas of later times.

38. That is, a panegyric composed by the Vedic poets in honour of patrons who have given them gifts and presents.

hood and victory in battle, are a gift from on high occurs elsewhere as well (5:79:7. 6:44:12. 7:92:3), and on one occasion, Agni is said to provide the worshipper *prajāvatā rādhasā* (1:94:15), with posterity as the pious man's possession.

The meaning 'offering' seems to be attested quite clearly in a few texts where *rādhas* occurs as the object of the verb *abhi-gīr-*, "to sing, celebrate" (1:100:17. 2:9:4. 10:7:2), but this point cannot be stressed since there is also the possibility – a possibility that is accepted by modern commentators on the RV – of understanding our word as a designation of the gift bestowed upon the worshipper.³⁹ In 2:12:14 the sense is unambiguous: for Indra *brāhman*⁴⁰ is a source of strength and soma a *rādhas*, i. e., offering. Again in 6:47:14 there is an analogous line of thought: praises, blessings and gifts flow to Indra, and soma are set before him as *rādhas*. Elsewhere in the same hymn we again come across the same term with the same meaning (cf. stanza 22). As there is nothing specially noteworthy in the other passages where *rādhas* is a synonym for 'offering', it is not necessary to dwell upon them. The last sense our term has in the RV will now be considered.

The idea of homage is prominent in 6:10:5 where the worshippers and singers claim that they surpass all others by their *rādhas*, i. e., their readiness to offer sacrifices of homage to the gods. The same line of thought occurs, too, in 10:29, a poem in Indra's honour, where the author states that he wishes to satiate the god with food as *upamam rādho*, highest homage (stanza 3). Man's action of offering worship and homage to the powers on high is, then, a *rādhas* or in modern terminology an exercise of *ārādhana*– or cult.

This discussion on the noun from *rādhas* ends with mention of the fact that once Indra is addressed as *rādhaspati*– (8:61:14), and elsewhere as *rādhanām pate* (1:30:5. 3:51:10), i. e.,

39. Cf. Geldner, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 285 f.

40. The meaning of the term here is "song", i. e., the song the poet is singing in honour of Indra. For a discussion, cf. the present writer's study, "Some Aspects of the R̥gvedic Conception of Vāk–", *Jeevadhara* 1 (1972) pp. 176–89.

“lord (master) of *rādhas*”.⁴¹ The gods are, therefore, the source of all blessings man can ever desire, so that anyone who yearns for favours from them quite naturally must address his prayers to them.

A few words on the verbal root *rādh-* which, as has already been noted at the beginning, is used only rarely in the RV will not be out of place. It did not have any great religious significance in the age of the first Veda. Lexicographers enumerate about four different sets of meanings that accrue to it in the R̥gvedic poems:⁴² (1) “to succeed, be successful, thrive, prosper”; (2) “to accomplish, perform, achieve, make ready, prepare, carry out”; (3) “to propitiate, conciliate, gratify”; (4) in the passive voice “to be conciliated, satisfied”. Since a detailed examination of texts is out of the question here it should suffice to mention briefly a couple of the most significant passages.

In a hymn addressed to Indra the poet claims that it is an easy matter to propitiate god’s heart (lit. mind), *evā te rādhyam manah* (8: 92:28). An analogous line of thought is expressed in a hymn in praise of Agni who is thought of as the *hotar* priest and is even likened to the sun: he is propitiated, *ārādhi* (1:70:8. Cf. 10:53:2). The performance of an act of homage to the gods — in concrete, the singing of their praises — is occasionally described with the help of the verbal root *rādh-*; e. g., *kō va stomam: rādhati*: “Who among mortals will be able to praise the gods in a worthy way, so that these later may find delight therein (10: 63:6)?” Another poet asks the Ādityas: *Kathā rādhāma . . . stomam* How can we worthily praise Mitra and Aryaman (1:41:7)?” (Cf. too 1:120:1 and 8:70:13). As the texts here cited more than amply prove, the verbal root *radh-* has as profound a religious significance as the noun form studied in the previous paragraphs.

III

We are now in a position to synthesize whatever has been said in the foregoing sections and see what their significance is

41. It may be noted that Sanskrit *pati-* represents IE *poti-s*, which for its part survives in Greek *posis*, “husband”, in Latin *potis* (occurring in *potis sum = possum*), etc.
42. Cf. Monier-Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 876.

for a better understanding of the term *ārādhana-* in our Indian context. The verbal root means, *inter alia*, "to propitiate, conciliate, gratify", the powers on high. The pious man, by singing the divine praises, gives pleasure to the gods and thereby also wins their benevolence, good will, favour and blessings. The favours the gods bestow upon those who sing their praises or have recourse to them in their hour of need are *rādhas* in the most comprehensive sense of the term. All that the pious folk of the Vedic age regarded as life's ultimate goal and yearned after most passionately— health, wealth, prosperity, a numerous progeny, victory over their foes, long life, bliss in the world of the fathers, etc. — can be termed *rādhas*, and inasmuch as any god like Indra can be the bestower of these blessings, he can be invoked as *rādhānam pati* or *rādhaspati*. In short, *rādhas* is the sum total of all the blessings bestowed from on high.

Reverting now to the noun *ārādhana-*, we say that it is an action noun that necessarily points to striving or endeavour on man's part to obtain any specific good or good in general from the gods. Considered essentially as man's endeavour, *ārādhana-* is adoration, worship, propitiation, etc., of the gods. It is an activity of the pious man who wishes to please the gods and obtain their favour. This is the meaning the term has in the text from the Bhagavad Gītā cited in the first part of this paper. All the lexicographical discussions here have been meant to bring to the forefront this specific sense of *ārādhana-*.

Is the meaning of *ārādhana* as outlined above consonant with the Christian understanding of 'cult' which has its moorings in the traditions of the two Testaments? The answer is that it has, but at the same time there are two basic differences between the worlds of ideas of the Bible and of India, differences which serve to bring out the specific characteristic of the two worlds and which must never be lost sight of by the investigator. Biblical tradition is rooted in faith in a personal God who is man's maker and master and who, according to the NT, is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. A faith of this kind is alien to the Vedic poets. Furthermore Biblical man's worship of God is closely bound up with a history whose central event is the fact of Christ. Such a connection with historical personages and

events is altogether foreign to the poetry of the RV. Anyone who sets out to study the religion of the Vedas and to compare it with the Judaeo-Christian religious tradition has always these two points.

According to Biblical tradition, cult, in the last analysis is a *Vergegenwärtigung*, a rendering present of the history of salvation with a view to the community's obtaining a share in God's free gifts, particularly the gift of salvation. In the OT the various feasts of the liturgical year and the different types of sacrifice had all this specific end in view, and as for the NT the supreme act of cult is the celebration of the Eucharist which is a proclamation of Christ's death until he comes, and means evidently the believer's sharing in the fruits of the Saviour's atoning death. It is quite legitimate to designate Biblical man's (and no doubt the Christian's) cult of God *ārādhana-*, for it is an endeavour on his part to obtain a share in his Maker's gracious and bountiful gifts, the greatest of which is salvation.

Put differently, from the point of view of our faith the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the supreme *rādhānām pati-rādhaspati-*, for as Jam. 1:17 notes, "Every good endowment and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights." The greatest gift he ever bestows upon man is a sharing in Christ's work of redemption, and *ārādhana-* is nothing but man's humble endeavour to obtain from God this specific *rādhas*. Understood thus, *ārādhana-* means not only what we call adoration in the strict sense but also all other expressions of the believer's basic attitude towards his lord and master such as propitiation (when there is a question of sin), gratitude or thanksgiving (when the individual has been the recipient of some special favour from on high), petition (when the believer feels the need of God's special help). (Christian worship in all its comprehensiveness can be defined as *ārādhana-* of the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Matthew 16: 13-16

— An Exegetical Study

The pericope appears in the Gospel according to St. Matthew.¹ Raised therein is the question: Who is Jesus?²

The question, who is Jesus, is capable of being approached in several ways. It can be approached historically³, biographically⁴, politically⁵, sociologically⁶ or theologically⁷ to consider some of the major possibilities. Similarly the answer to the question 'Who is

1) Matthew 16: 13-16; *The Holy Bible*, Authorised Version (Chicago: The Gideons, 1955), p. 678. Also see Burton H. Throckmorton ed., *Gospel parallels* (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1957), p. 88.

2) Matthew 16: 13, 15.

3) e. g. Did Jesus exist? Will we know who he was as historical figure? etc.; see Shirley Jackson Case, *The Historicity of Jesus* (University of Chicago Press, 1912); James M. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus* (London: SCM Press Ltd. 1959 etc.

4) e. g. What kind of a personality did Jesus have? What kind of a life did He lead? etc.; see Vincent Taylor, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1955), John Knox, *The Man Christ Jesus* (Chicago: Willett, Clark and Co., 1941) etc.

5) e. g. Was Jesus leading a revolt against the Romans? For a reference to Jesus in such a context see C. K. Barrett, *The New Testament Background: Selected Documents* (London: SPCK 1956), p. 198-99; also see S. G. F. Brandon, *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth* (New York: Stein and Day, 1968); etc.

6) e. g. Was Jesus a social reformer, proclaiming a new ethic? See T. W. Manson, *Ethics and the Gospel* (London: SCM Press, 1960); J. Arthur Baird, *The Justice of God in the Teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1963); etc.

7) e. g. Was Jesus the Messiah? Was Jesus the son of God? etc.; for talking of Christ christologically see Albert Schweitzer *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God: the Secret of Jesus' Messiah and Passion* (New York: Macmillan, 1954.)

Jesus?' can be sought at the several levels of what God⁸, spirits⁹, the people¹⁰, the apostles or the evangelists¹¹ thought he was. One could also consider what Christ thought He was.

The aim of this exegetical exercise is to make explicit the meaning of the pericope. The first step towards such an explanation would then consist of identifying the correct level at which the question is asked and the answer attempted in the pericope.

II

It is quite manifest that in the pericope the question 'Who is Jesus?' is to be approached theologically. One can be more precise. The question is asked in a definite prophetic Messianic context. Jesus uses the term 'Son of Man' of himself¹² an exclusive self-characterization with an apocalyptic significance¹³. The

8) see Mark 9:7

9) see Luke 4:41

10) Several categories are possible here, considering the diversity of peoples involved in the early Christian movement; vide Helmut Koester, *The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity*, *Harvard Theological Review* (July 1965), pp. 279-318. One might ask, for instance, what the Jews thought of Him or the Gentiles, or the Aramaic-speaking Church or the Greek-speaking Church etc.

11) The distinction between the level of the apostles and the evangelists is particularly important as there seems to be general agreement that the 'Matthew' who authored the gospel is not the same as Matthew the apostle, vide W. G. Kummel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Abingdon press, 1966), p. 84-86.

12) Matthew 16:13

13) see James L. Price, *Interpreting the New Testament* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1961), p. 245-250.

It has been suggested that the Jesus' question is not what men think of him but what they take the coming Son of Man to be like. J. C. Fenton argues convincingly, however, that this is unlikely because (1) of the parallel in 5:15 where *you* is emphatic and (2) because elsewhere in Matthew 'Son of Man' is Jesus' self-characterization, vide *The Gospel of St. Matthew* (Penguin Book, 1963), p. 267.

people are also shown as identifying Him variously with John the Baptist, Elias, Jeremias or 'one of the prophets'.

The context further indicates that the *answer* to the question is sought at two levels in the pericope: (1) who the people think Jesus is, and (2) who the disciples think Jesus is. But the text as we have it is not the work of the apostle but the evangelist so that ineluctably a third level becomes relevant: (3) who the evangelist Matthew thought Christ was.

III

Let us now examine the pericope for the kind of answer the *people* gave to the question who Jesus was. Who are these people? And what is their opinion about Jesus? The people are the Jews among whom Jesus was preaching¹⁴ and their opinion was that Jesus was a prophet.¹⁵

14) The geographical setting of the pericope (the 'coasts of Caesarea Philippi') and its historical context, (which is after he has preached vigorously among the Jews and has now gone into retreat with his disciples) leads to this conclusion; see Floyd V. Filson, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 185.

15) The verse 16: 14 is important both for what it does and does not say. The prophets mentioned are John the Baptist, Elias and Jeremias. "If the Baptist was believed to be Elijah returned from heaven and if Jesus was believed to be John resurrected he would be Elijah" (J. C. Fenton, *Op Cit.*, p. 267-8). So much for John the Baptist and Elias. Jeremias has been added by Matthew (Cf. Mark 8:28 and Luke 9:19) and this poses something of a problem (vide K. Stendhal, *The School of St. Matthew* Copenhagen: Villadsen and Christensen, 1967), p. 123. J. C. Fenton indicates that "there is some evidence that some Jews expected Jeremiah (and other prophets) to return at the end of the world" *Op Cit.*, p. 268).

In the pericope Jesus calls Himself the 'Son of Man.' This recalls "directly or indirectly a vision in the Book of Daniel, Chapter 7" (James L. Price, *op cit.* p. 248). This reference is apocalyptic and majestic and the fact that the people are *not* shown as mentioning Daniel but rather Elias *et al* further serves to emphasize their recognition of Jesus only as a prophet and not as the Messiah.

When Jesus was told this he pointedly asked His disciples, "But who say ye that I am?"¹⁶ This provides us with the next level of response in the pericope—that of his *disciples* rather than of the people. The particular disciple who actually answers is Peter. His answer is striking.¹⁷ He implies that Jesus is not merely a prophet as the people say but states unequivocally that Jesus is Christ, the Son of God.

IV

A stage has now been reached in this exegetical exercise when it is opportune to interrelate three key-terms occurring in the pericope: (1) prophet¹⁸, (2) Messiah¹⁹, and (3) Son of God.²⁰ Each term successively conveys a more exalted meaning. Thus, there have been many prophets but there will be only one Messiah, at the most two.²¹ A Messiah may also be a prophet but all prophets are not Messiahs. Though the concepts of Prophet and Messiah in Judaism are never quite clearly defined there is no doubt that the Messiah is a cut above the prophet in the hierarchy of divinity. The disciples see in Jesus the Messiah, whereas the people see Jesus as a prophet.²² It is this difference

16) Matthew 16:15

17) Matthew 16:16. The fact that Jesus is struck by the answer is further shown by the fact that in the next two verses, which are found only in Matthew, Jesus singles out Peter as the rock on which he would build his Church (Matthew 16:17-18). There is a word-play on Peter (*petros*) and rock (*petra*); see *Westminster Study Bible N. T.* (New York: William Collins and Sons, 1965), p. 46 fn.; also see J. M. Gibson, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (New York: George H. Doran and Co., 1920), p. 221-222.

18) see G. A. Buttrick, ed., *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. III (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 896.

19) *Ibid.*, p. 360.

20) *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 408.

21) As at Qumran vide F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1958), p. 65-66.

22) For Jesus as a prophet see S. G. F. Brandon, *A Dictionary of Comparative Religion* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970), p. 512. For Jesus' acceptance of himself as a prophet see Luke 4:24.

in theological perception which sets the disciples apart from the people²³, and Peter apart from the other disciples, for he among the disciples articulates this assessment of Jesus and feels it most keenly.²⁴

When we now compare the pericope synoptically with Mark and Luke a discrepancy appears. It consists in the fact that in Matthew Jesus is *also* called 'Son of the Living God' in addition to being called Christ.²⁵ One hears here the special accent of the author, for Mark and Luke do not go beyond calling Jesus 'Christ'.²⁶ How is this individuality of Matthew to be explained?

The explanation lies in the theological purpose of Matthew. One of its main purposes is to raise "the stature of Jesus into the divine by using appropriate expressions," This exaltation of stature the evangelist has achieved in this pericope by inserting the expression 'Son of living God'. Just as the Messiah is more

23) This contrast between the opinion of the people and the disciples is grammatically brought out by the fact that the Greek expression (*hymeis de*) used in 16:15 for you is emphatic, vide J.C. Fenton, *op cit.*, p. 268.

24) It should be noted here that the evangelists looked upon Jesus as the Messiah but the disciples may have started considering Him such only after the resurrection vide R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1951), p. 27. The recognition of Jesus as the Messiah in this Pericope then may be a case of the superimposition on traditional material of the evangelist's own faith in the Messiahship of Jesus (*Ibid.*, p. 26). Or is it that the primacy of Peter among the disciples derives from the fact that even before the Resurrection he had become convinced, more than the rest, of Jesus' Messianic potential if not status? In any case, the emergent primacy of Peter among the disciples in the other synoptic gospels is an established fact in Matthew. In 10:2 Matthew adds the word "first" before 'Simon, who is called Peter'; in 14:28 he gives the story of Peter walking on water; in 17:24 and 18:21 he refers to Peter who is mentioned thus not in Mark, and in 16: 18-19 he makes Peter stand out as the apostle *par excellence*.

25) Matthew 16: 16

26) Mark 8: 29; Luke 9: 20

exalted than the prophet, the Son of God is more exalted than the Messiah. In the Judaic tradition the Messiah was the son of David, not of God, though he was the anointed of God, but Matthew hails Jesus in this pericope as the Son of God.²⁷ Source criticism, which looks upon Matthew as a 'revised and enlarged edition of Mark'²⁸ supports this conclusion. The enlargement by the addition of nativity stories in the gospel²⁹ and the upward revision by the added description 'Son of God'³⁰ in the pericope show Matthew as advancing beyond Mark in the exaltation of Jesus.

27) "...the most remarkable fact is that all the gospels, in contrast to Jewish literature, emphasize the point that the Messiah is *also* the Son of God." G. A. Buttrick, *Op. Cit.*, Vol. 4, p. 409.

28) James L. Price, *Op. Cit.*, p. 191.

29) But note in the context of these stories that Matthew "curiously does not use the phrase 'Son of God'". vide G. A. Buttrick, ed. *op. cit.*, Vol. 4, p. 411.

30) The title 'Son of God' used for Jesus is the exegetical key to this Matthean pericope in several ways.

(i) The title 'Son of God' for Jesus calls attention to "his miraculous birth, to his filial relationship to God and to his relationship to his disciples who were also in a true, though different sense, sons of God," G. A. Buttrick, *Op. Cit.*, Vol. 4, p. 411. (ii) In the Synoptics, its presence in Matthew and absence in Luke and Mark provides an interpretative turning point. Among the four gospels, it also enables one to contrast Matthew with John. Whereas in the Johannine gospel the fact that Jesus is the 'Son of God' is patent, here in the Matthean passage it has the force and impact of a fresh realization (Cf. Matthew 16: 13-16 with John 6: 68-69).

(iii) The expression 'Son of God' is not to be interpreted as 'simply a Messianic designation' (Floyd L. Filson, *Op. Cit.* p. 184 in the Hellenistic sense that all great saviours of mankind are 'sons of God' (James L. Price, *Op. Cit.*, p. 296). That it has a special vibrant connotation is indicated by the use of the expression 'Son of the *living* God' and by the fact that Matthew repeatedly emphasizes Jesus' unique nature as consisting of his sole sonship (vide, Matthew 2:15; 3:17; 4:3; 8:29; 11:27; 14:33 etc.)

(iv) The understanding of Jesus as the 'Son of God' seems to

Thus, the pericope spells out and sums up the various answers to the question, 'Who is Jesus?' when faced theologically. Jesus is a prophet; what is more, he is also the Messiah; and more than that he is the Son of God. A prophet assumes a special relationship with God and a special role with the people: that of 'prophecy'; a Messiah assumes a special relationship with God and a special role with his people; that of acting as their 'Saviour'. Jesus was both and something more. He, in the eyes of the evangelists assumed a special *filial* relationship with God and a special role with the people – that of saving them in his special way by proclaiming the imminence of the Kingdom of God, His Father.³¹

have varied according to the level at which it was received. In Gentile Christianity it acquired connotations of belief in the pre-existence of Jesus etc.; vide J. L. Price, *Op. Cit.*, p. 118.

Moving backwards, in the earliest Aramaic Church it "may have signified simply a belief in Jesus' exaltation as the king – Messiah" (James L. Price, *Op. Cit.*, p. 117). Moving further backward, among the disciples it might have been Jesus' complete submission to the will of God the Father, more than anything else, which might have led his disciples to hail him as the 'Son of God' (see T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, Cambridge University Press, 1951, p. 89). Finally, Jesus seems to have "believed himself to stand in a unique filial relationship to God" (see J. G. Davies, *Christianity: the Early Church*, in R. C. Zachner, ed., *The Concise Encyclopedia of Living Faiths*, New York: Hawthorn Books Inc. 1959, p. 54). Note, for instance, the use of the more familiar form *abba* – used for the earthly progenitor – over *ahbi* the more normal form for an Aramaic-speaking Jew in the prayer in the garden of Gethsemane (see Mark. 24:36). The emphasis Jesus laid among his disciples on not revealing this filial relationship to others also underscores its unique character in the eyes of Jesus (see Luke 4: 41; Matthew 16: 19, 26-63 etc).

31) Looked at another way, in distinguishing between Jesus as a prophet and as the Messiah the pericope contrasts the popular assessment with the apostolic; and in distinguishing between Jesus as the Messiah and as the Son of God it contrasts the Judaic position with the Christian.

This exegetical background may now be brought to bear on the paraphrase, which follows:

After having preached for some time Jesus retreated to the district of Caesarea Philippi. There He asked His disciples while he regarded himself as the 'Son of Man', how the people regarded him. The disciples replied that the people made four identifications of him: (1) John the Baptist (2) Elijah (3) Jeremiah, and (4) one of the prophets.

Then Jesus asked his disciples how *they* would identify him. Peter, from among the disciples, replied that whereas the people regarded Jesus as a prophet He was really the Messiah. Moreover, He was that Messiah who was not just the anointed of God but the Son of God himself.

Fall 1972

Arvind Sharma
Harvard Divinity School

Bibliographical Bulletin

It is the purpose of this bulletin to give the readers of *Jeevadhara* some information regarding a few of the most significant publications that have just appeared (or are about to appear) and that are a 'must' for all those who are interested in Biblical and Indological studies. We wish, too, to point out that there are, in the two fields just mentioned, very many other specialized publications which, for reasons of time and space, cannot be included in this survey. We begin with the works dealing with the Scriptures.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia quae antea cooperantibus A. Alt, O. Eissfeldt, P. Kahle ediderat R. Kittel. Editio funditus renovata, adjuvantibus H. Bardtke, W. Baumgartner, P. A. H. de Boer, O. Eissfeldt, J. Fichtener, G. Gerleman, J. Hempel, F. Horst, A. Jepsen, F. Maass, R. Meyer, G. Quell, Th. H. Robinson, D. W. Thomas, cooperantibus H. P. Rüger et J. Ziegler, ediderunt K. Elliger et W. Rudolph. Textum Masoreticum curavit H. P. Rüger. Masoram elaboravit G. E. Weil (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1968 ff.).

This new publication of the venerable and celebrated Württemberg Bible Society is actually the fourth edition of Rudolf Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (3rd ed., Stuttgart, 1937), but so completely and thoroughly revised that it is quite right to say that barely a stone of the predecessor is left in place! The two editors, viz. Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph, are in all truth patriarchs in the world of OT scholarship, men whose competence is internationally recognized. Johannes Ziegler (a Catholic priest), one of the greatest authorities on the Greek version of the OT who has for several years been engaged in editing the massive, multi-volume Septuagint published under the auspices of the Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, is the one who is responsible for the LXX part of the *BHS*. It has often been pointed out that the LXX data in *BH* were at times inaccurate and unreliable, but in the new edition Ziegler has not only checked all the

entries but also has furnished fresh material from the collection at his disposal in Göttingen. The Masorah is prepared by the Jewish scholar Gérard E. Weil, a disciple of Paul Kahle, the editor of the *Masora Parva* in the third edition of *BH*.

The manuscript that serves as the basis of *BHS* is the Leningrad Codex (abbr. *L*) which, as Kahle has pointed out, is the oldest dated manuscript of the complete Hebrew Bible, but this reliance upon *L* must not induce us to think that the new edition is nothing but *BH* with only a change of title, for as a matter of fact *BHS* includes several new features, two of which will be mentioned here briefly. This edition supplies us, for the first time, with references to the *Masorah Magna* of *L*, arranged numerically from 1 to 4271, the latter number representing the sum total of the lists in the *Massorah Gedolah* (reviewed below).

Coming to the critical apparatus, one has to note that it has been radically modified. Instead of the double apparatus in *BH*, there is only a single one, which is also quite remarkable for the omission of fantastic conjectures and emendations proposed in the heydays of radical criticism. The material from the Qumran findings and Sperber's edition of the Targums (under the title *The Bible in Aramaic*, I-III, Leiden, 1959-62) is incorporated into the text, but the reader gets also a shock as he perceives that (at least in the first fascicles) there is no reference to another work of Sperber's, namely, his edition of *Codex Reuchlinianus* (Alexander Sperber, *The Pre-Masoretic Bible*). *Codex Reuchlinianus*, No. 3 of the Badische Landesbibliothek in Karlsruhe (formerly Darlach No. 55) with a General introduction: Masoretic Hebrew Corpus Codicum Hebraicorum Medii Aevi redigendum curavit Rafael Edelman, pars II^a, Copenhagen, 1959; id., *The Prophets according to the Codex Reuchlinianus* (in a Critical Analysis), Leiden, 1969). As is well known, this manuscript represents a special Masoretic tradition. One misses, too, references to Manfred Dietrich, *Neue palästinisch punktierte Bibelfragmente* (Masorah, Série II, Études, Ier volume, Leiden, 1968).

The *BHS* is appearing in fascicles. The present writer has with him D. Winton Thomas, *Liber Jesaiae* (1968), H. Bardtke, *Liber Psalmorum* (1969), and O. Eissfeldt, *Liber Genesis* (1969). Some more fascicles have appeared, but getting them here in

India is a problem. All should be happy learn that an additional fascicle on Sirach will also be issued as part of *BHS*. Needless to say, the new edition, like its predecessors, will be of great service to the student of the Hebrew Bible.

G. E. Weil, *Massorah Gedolah, juxta Codicem Leningradensem*. Vol. I: *Les listes de la Massorah* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1971). XXVII + 463 + 69 pp. US dol. 42.00.

It was in 1926 that Paul Kahle happened to come across, in the Public Library of Leningrad, the *Codex Leningradensis* of the Hebrew Bible with the complete Masorah, and one of Kahle's greatest ambitions was to publish a full edition of the Masorah, manuscript *L*. The work that he began came to be impeded and interrupted as he was forced to flee from Nazi Germany for the 'crime' of giving shelter to Jews, and shortly before his death he entrusted the material he had prepared to his student, Professor Gérard E. Weil, director of the biblical and masoretic section of the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes du Centre National de Recherche Scientifique. This critical edition will appear in four volumes, and we have now before us the first volume of Weil's great work published simultaneously by the Biblical Institute and the Wurttemberg Bible Society (Stuttgart).

Vol. I is in point of fact an edition of a sum total of 4271 Masoretic lists (arranged in the order 1 to 4271), beginning with the first word of the Hebrew Bible. The Masorah of *L* includes a lot of repetitions which do not in any way contribute to a better understanding of the Biblical text, and which have therefore been omitted from the lists in the present edition.

The price of Vol. I is such as to make the scripturist in India shudder. In addition the ability to make a fruitful use of the Masorah presupposes not only a good mastery of Hebrew but also an initiation into the Masorah, which unfortunately is a field in which very few Christian scholars can lay claim to competence. In this short survey it is not possible to give some idea of the Masoretic lists of Weil's edition and of the way in which they are to be used, but the present writer is preparing an *ex professo* study which will illustrate in some detail the nature

and method of procedure of the Masorah with examples taken from *L*. All our seminary libraries should have a complete set of Weil's *Massorah Gedolah*, and any professor who wishes to do full justice to the OT must make constant use of it.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. In Verbindung mit George W. Anderson, Henri Cazelles, David N. Freedman, Shemarjahu Talmon und Gerhard Wallis herausgegeben von G. Johannes Botterweck und Helmar Ringgren. Band I, Lieferungen 1-5 (Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1970 ff.) Subskriptionspreis für jede Lief. DM 16.

Even in a mission country like India seminarians are by now quite familiar with Kittel-Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuem Testament*; in English translation, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (7 vols. so far). This veritable encyclopaedia is useful not only to students of the NT but also to those of the OT, as it includes studies of the data furnished by the Hebrew Bible. Now as the counterpart of Kittel-Friedrich there has appeared Botterweck-Ringgren, and already five fascicles (1970-72), covering 640 columns, have been issued in fairly rapid succession. The *TWAT* differs from *TWNT* in more than one respect. Whereas the latter is an exclusive work of Protestant scholarship, the former is an ecumenical project in which Catholic, Protestant and Jewish scholars are participating without any regard for confessional barriers and the like. In the *TWNT* comparative Semitic philology, the findings of Sumeriology, Assyriology, Hethitology, etc. are not adequately taken into account, but *TWAT* does full justice to the fields just mentioned. To illustrate what has been said, there is added here the plan of the article *Babel* in *TWAT*: I. The name Babel (from 'Babilla' which is neither Accadian nor Sumerian; in Sumerian (*ká-dingir-ra*); II. The Building of the Tower (reference is made to Sumerian and Accadian antecedents); III. Babel in the Prophets. In the article *Babel* in *TWNT* we miss all these details.

From what has just been said the conclusion should not be drawn that *TWAT* is primarily a work of Sumeriology or Assyriology or pure Semitic philology. It is essentially a work of theology like its NT counterpart. The entries include a fairly detailed theological exegesis of relevant passages from the Hebrew

Bible, and all those who have to teach exegesis or Biblical theology can, with a little patience and effort, exploit the treasures lying hidden in the columns of *TWAT*.

The work, when completed, will cover four volumes, each having approximately 1540 columns (770 pages). Every year 3-4 fascicles are expected to appear (price per fascicle 16 Dm; bound volume 190 DM (cloth) 200 DM (leather). Perhaps, sooner or later, there may appear an English translation of *TWAT*, but even in that case subscribing for the German original will never be a loss.

Ernestus Vogt, *Lexicon linguae aramaicae Veteris Testamenti Documentis antiquis illustratum* (Rome: Biblical Institute 1971).: 192 pp. US dol. 11. 50.

All biblical scholars in India have been students of Fr. Vogt at the Biblical Institute, and they will be most happy to have now at their disposal a dictionary of the Aramaic sections of the OT from the pen of their revered master. Those who have studied under him know the calibre and quality of his scholarship and acumen, so that any description of the book becomes superfluous. A good review of the *Lexicon* may be found in *CBQ* 34 (1972) pp. 394 f. Zorell's *Lexicon Hebraicum Veteris Testamenti* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1956). This and the Fr Vogt's new work are indispensable aids for the theological exegesis of the Hebrew Bible.

For the sake of those who may be interested in recent publications in the field of North-West Semitic philology, and specifically in Aramaic, mention may be made here of some books which are excellent works of reference and include information which can never be supplied by any dictionary. Fr. Vogt makes constant reference to H. Bauer-P. Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (Halle-Salle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1927). A reprint of this basic work has been issued by Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, Hildesheim, 1962 (price DM 54). — R. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik der Inschriften des 10.-8. Jh. v. Chr.* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes III/38, Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag, 1969). 162 pp. DM 34. — H. Donner-W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften. I. Texte* (2nd ed., Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1966). 69 pp. DM 14. II.

Kommentar (2nd ed., ibidem, 1968). 359 pp. DM 44. III. *Glossar und Indizes, Tafeln* (2nd ed., ibidem, 1969). 90 pp., 34 plates. DM 24. — S. Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik* Lehrbücher für das Studium der orientalischen und afrikanischen Sprachen, Bd. XX, (Leipzig, 1972). The present writer is not sure whether this book is out yet. Lastly mention must be made of Ch. F. Jean-J. Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest* (Leiden, 1962).

Biblia Sacra juxta Vulgatam Versionem, adjuvantibus Bonifatio Fischer OSB, Johanne Gribomont OSB, H. F. D. Sparks, W. Tiele recensuit et brevi apparatu instruxit Robertus Weber. Tomus I: *Genesis-Psalms*. Tomus II: *Proverbia-Apocalypsis. Appendix* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1969). XXXII + 1980 pp. DM. 56.

St. Jerome's Latin translation of the Bible, known as the Vulgate, has for centuries served as the official Biblical version of the Latin Church, but the wonder of wonders is that the Church has not been able to produce a manual edition of the Vulgate to stand on a par with Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* or Rahlfs' *Septuaginta*. It is true that there have been numerous editions of the Latin Bible, but unfortunately hardly any of them had scientific value. The reason for this tragic plight need not be probed into here. It should be sufficient to note that it has never been the lack of competent scholars, as anyone familiar with the work done by the Benedictines charged with the critical edition of the Vulgate will concede without much ado. Now at last we have a beautiful, scholarly, two-volume edition of the Vulgate published by the Wurttemberg Bible Society which, incidentally, is an organ of the Lutheran Church in Germany.

The most significant feature of *BS* is the critical apparatus whose value can never be overestimated, for the scholar is now in a position to evaluate the intrinsic value and worth of the reading he intends to study in some depth. The text is printed in double columns on each page and is arranged in a poetical fashion, so that reading becomes quite easy and pleasant. St. Jerome's prologues are added to the various books of the two

Testaments, and in proper names traditional orthography is followed. Spellings such as Israhel, Samuhel, Hieroboam, etc., which may appear barbaric to the uninitiated but which will be a welcome feature to the specialist are avoided. This observation is also valid in the case of forms such as *disrumpamus*, *inridebit*, *adprehendite*, etc. The Book of Psalms appears in a double vesture: the editors have given not only the text of the so-called *Psalterium Gallicanum* but also that of *Psalterium juxta Hebraeos*. Since the latter has almost been unavailable in the market its inclusion in the present edition will be welcomed by all.

In the preface it is said that the text of some books will have to be modified when the massive and exhaustive edition of the Vulgate prepared by the Benedictines is completed; this is particularly true in regard to the Books of the Prophets. The work has, then, its limitations, particularly since the text is at times only provisional. Nevertheless there is no exaggeration in saying that we have now at our disposal a scholarly and scientific edition of the Vulgate. This edition may go unnoticed among Catholics because of the strong prejudice against the Latin language, caused by the blind fanaticism of groups who endeavoured to impose Latin at all costs. Things are, however, bound to change, and the Latin Vulgate will be accorded the importance that is its due by all lovers of the word of God.

We wish also to include in this survey of publications a couple of books which, though of paramount importance for Indologists, may not be reviewed in the periodicals we usually get in our seminaries.

Emile Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. 1. *Economie, parenté, société*; 2. *Pouvoir, droit, religion* (Paris: Les éditions Minuit, 1969). 376 + 340 pp. NF 54.

Here we have a work by one who is no doubt the greatest French Indo-Europeanist of the period after World War II; one who is a master not only in the field of historical (diachronic) linguistics but also in that of structural (synchronic, descriptive) linguistics. It is the fruit of many years of study and researches and embodies a wealth of information which the Indologist can most fruitfully exploit. The fact should not be hidden that even

people who have a good mastery of Sanskrit but are not professional Indo-Europeanists will find reading it rather stiff, but there are short summaries before the studies in the two volumes, which will certainly lighten the burden of the reader.

Vol. 1 is divided into three books which are again subdivided into sections and chapters. Book I deals with economy (pp. 17-202), Book II with vocabulary of relationship (pp. 205-75) and Book III with social status (pp. 279-373). Vol. 2, too, is divided into three books dealing successively with royalty and its privileges (pp. 9-94), right or law (pp. 99-174), and lastly, religion (pp. 179-279). The volume comes to a close with a "tableau des langues indo-européennes, a "note bibliographiques" and three indices ("index des matières," "index des mots étudiés," and "index des passages cités").

Both the volumes include studies which are of importance for the Indologist. Vol. 1, for example, contains a pretty long study entitled "La tripartition des fonctions" (pp. 279-92) which is of the utmost importance for a full understanding of the Indo-European *arrière fond* of "castes." But it is the third part of vol. 2 that will be most welcome to professors of Indology: numerous terms that have a profound religious significance (or, if one may say so, theological significance) in Indian tradition are studied with constant reference to cognates and parallels in the other Indo-European languages. The detailed index of the Sanskrit words discussed will make reference quite easy.

It would be the worst form of temerity on the present writer's part to criticize some of the views of one who began his scholarly career even before he was born. Honesty, however, demands that he should point out that not all professional scholars will endorse each and every interpretation proposed by Benveniste, but that is something inevitable in any work of scholarship.

Manfred Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. A Concise Etymological Dictionary of Sanskrit*. Lieferungen 18-22 (pp. 1-400. Indogermanische Bibliothek. 2. Reihe: Wörterbücher, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1963-70).

The purpose of this note is to announce to the reader the good tidings that at last Mayrhofer's comparative and etymological dictionary of Sanskrit is about to reach completion. The first fascicle appeared soon after the Second World War and by 1963 two substantial volumes (fascicles 1-17) were available to the Indo-Europeanist and Sanskritist. Now that fascicle 22 has already appeared and the *latter śa* has been reached, what remains is not much. The fascicles beginning with no. 18 will form the third volume of Mayrhofer's dictionary.

In the course of the present century two notable attempts have been made to publish a comparative and etymological dictionary of Sanskrit: E. and J. Leumann's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Sanskrit-Sprache* (Strassburg, 1907) covers only the first letters of the Sanskrit alphabet. Of W. Wüst's massive *Vergleichendes und Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Alt-Indoarischen [Altindischen]* only the first fascicle ever appeared (Heidelberg, 1935). The only comparative dictionary of Sanskrit available so far has been C. C. Uhlenbeck, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der altindischen Sprache* (Amsterdam, 1898; repr., 1968), which, however, is too brief to be of much use. Mayrhofer's work then, answers a most pressing need.

Professors of Indology in our seminaries can most profitably use Mayrhofer, for almost the entire vocabulary of India's vast literature is surveyed, and terms that have religious or philosophical significance (e. g., *asura*, *brāhman*, *dhārman*, *māya*, etc.) are discussed in detail and with constant reference to the view proposed by various scholars. All through the author's approach is cautious and conservative particularly when there is question of controversial or doubtful issues, and there are no grounds for the fear that the non-specialist will be misled or confused. Since all those who handle Indology in our seminaries know Latin and may have even some smattering of German, Greek, etc. the work can easily be utilized, and they will have often surprises awaiting them, as, for instance, when they come to know that *cakra*, *wheel*, and *cycle* (Greek *kuklos*) come from the same root. An acquaintance with Indo-European philology will help them to understand the reason for the difference in the forms just cited.

W. Schwartz-O. E. Pfeiffer *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz 1973-). Ca. 960 pp. (ca. DM 282).

The *Otto Harrassowitz Informationen* have announced the publication of a new dictionary of Sanskrit whose first fascicle is expected to appear in the course of the current year, but what is peculiar about the work is that it is a "retrograde" dictionary, i. e., words are cited not with their first letter but with the last, so that, a person who remembers only the ending of a word, or who has to work with fragmentary texts, can find out words without difficulty. The book will evidently be of very limited interest to the average professor of Indology, but one who intends to specialize and to study in depth morphology, word formation, etc. will find in it a most invaluable *Arbeitsinstrument*.

René Zwolanek, "vāyav indraśca." *Studien zu Anrufungsformen im Vedischen, Awestischen und Griechischen* (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 5, Neue Folge. Munich: Kieztinger Verlag, 1971). 90 pp. DM 9. 80.

Zwolanek's work is a Ph. D. dissertation submitted to the University of Zurich (1969). It is a form-critical study of the formulae of invocation in the Vedas, in the Avesta or the Zarathushtrian scriptures, and in Greek poetry, and represents and endeavour to elucidate a specific grammatical feature appearing in the literary traditions of the Aryans and the Greeks: when two persons (gods) are addressed, the name of the first is put in the vocative case and that of the second in the nominative case, and both the appellations are joined together by the Indo-European conjunction *-kwe* which appears in Sanskrit as *ca* and in Latin as *que*; hence the pattern A (voc.) + B (nom.) + *kwe*. Most of the examples of this procedure are furnished by the *R̥gveda*; e. g., *vāyav indraśca*. At times the two names are separated from each other through insertion of words or even *stichoi* (lines), and there are also passages in which the pattern is changed with the help of the so-called inverse *ca* and accordingly we have the type, *indraś ca vāyav*. We need not, and even cannot, in this short account go into, all the explanations of this usage put forward by specialists, but it should be enough to point out that Zwolanek's monograph adequately treats the whole problem.

The book is quite important inasmuch as it is a form-critical investigation of a part of the poetical material preserved by the earliest literary traditions of some of the Indo-European peoples of antiquity, and the particular usage studied by the author goes back to the period of Indo-European unity. We all know how fruitful the application of the *formgeschichtlich, Methode* (form-critical method) to the Bible has turned out to be and there is not the least doubt that use of this method will contribute to a better understanding of India's scriptures.

Kamil Zvelebil, *Comparative Dravidian Phonology* (Janua Linguarum, Series practica, 80, The Hague: Mouton, 1970). 202pp. DM 54. 50.

"Dravidology" is a science that is much older than Indo-European philology, for even before Sanskrit was detected by Western scholars, missionaries from Europe had composed excellent grammars of the greatest of all Dravidian languages, namely, Tamil, and had also drawn up fairly exhaustive dictionaries. These men were not, of course, interested in philology and comparative grammar, but, oddly enough, it was a British missionary, Bishop Robert Caldwell, who published the first work in this field, entitled *Comparative grammar of the Dravidian or South Indian Family of Languages* (1856). Several missionaries like Kittel, Guntert and others did good work in the field of Dravidian studies, and in the course of the present century such scholars as Sten Konow, Jules Bloch, and L. V. Ramaswamy Aiyar did much to promote the scientific study of the Dravidian languages; among living authorities we must mention Bh. Krishnamurti, M. B. Emenau and T. Burrow (authors of a comparative and etymological dictionary of the Dravidian languages), and Kamil Zvelebil (born in 1927, in Prague), the author of the book under review.

For the sake of those who may not be familiar with Dravidology, it may be pointed out that all the major Universities in Europe and America now have departments of Dravidian studies. As for the Dravidian languages themselves, one of them, viz, *Brahui*, is spoken by tribal people living in the border areas of Pakistan and Afghanistan! And the languages themselves number more than 25, a figure that is certainly bound to shoot up in course of time. We reproduce here from Zvelebil's book (p. 13) a list as many readers may not be acquainted at all with these

languages: Southern group: Toda, Kota, Irula, Tamil, Malayalam, Kodagu, Kannada, Badaga, and Tulu; Central group: Telugu, Savara, Kolami, Naikri, Naiki (Chanda), Parji, Gadba (Ollari), Gadba (Salur / Poya), Gadba (Pottangi), Kui, Kuvi, Konda, Pengo, Manda, Gondi (Dorla), Gondi (Koya), Gondi (Maria), Gondi (Muria), and Gondi (Raj); Northern group: Kurukh (Oraon), Malto, and Brahui.

Zvelebil's latest work is an exhaustive and systematic study of Dravidian vowels, consonants and consonantal clusters with a view to establishing phonological correspondences as a first step towards the writing of a comparative and historical grammar of Dravidian languages. The book comes to an end with two appendices, three addenda, and an index. All those who are acquainted with the studies of Professor Zvelebil know the high quality of his scholarship, and the book we are considering is a 'must' for every serious student of Dravidian linguistics. It is impossible to give in this note even a faint idea of the amount of material available in this volume of 196 pages. One has to take it and read it with care and attention, and time thus spent will be rewarded a hundredfold.

This bulletin comes to a close with a passing reference to two major works, in English translation, to be issued by Motilal Banarsidass (Delhi-Patna-Varanasi). The most important Sanskrit dictionary ever published is the seven-volume *Sanskrit Wörterbuch* of Otto Bohtlingk and Rudolf Roth, conventionally known as the *St. Petersburg Dictionary*, from the place of publication. This work has been translated into English by Madhusudan Mishra, Research Fellow in the Department of Sanskrit, University of Delhi, and has been edited by J. L. Shastri: the translation is not yet available in the market, but when it is, all our major institutions of Christian learning should have a set. Any serious work in the field of Indology is impossible without reference to this dictionary. — Another publication which Banarsidass has announced is the English translation of Grassmann's *Wörterbuch zum RigVeda*, which is, as a matter of fact, a concordance of the RV in the form of a dictionary. The book can be most fruitfully used by those who have a fairly good knowledge of Vedic Sanskrit, and it too is a 'must' for our seminary libraries.

Book Review

Metanoia, Faith, Covenant: A Study in Pauline Theology by J. Pathrapankal, (Dharmaram College, Bangalore 29), pp. XV-327, Cloth Rs. 17; Paper Rs. 14.

This volume is Fr Patrapankal's doctoral dissertation at Gregorianum, Rome. Fr Pathrapankal's study centres around two basic biblical concepts, *Metanoia* and Faith in their relation to the Covenant. The book falls into two parts. After investigating the history of research on this topic and summing up the results in an introductory chapter, he proceeds to a philological and thematic analysis of *Metanoia* and Faith. The author argues that the hebrew "*shubh*" and "*he emin*" gradually chrystallize into the New Testament *Metanoia* and *Pistis*. Both '*shuba*' and '*he emin*' have a covenantal signification. In the thematic study he observes that "faith is an all embracing attitude of man toward the covenant-God, on the basis of past benefits and future promises. It is the way of entering into and remaining in the covenant relation with Yahweh." In the New Testament faith takes on the added nuance of accepting God's eschatological intervention in Christ. '*Shubh*' is the act of returning to fidelity towards the covenant. It is an urgent call addressed to Israel to return to the covenant existence through a renewed faith, from which she had fallen away mainly through apostasy and idolatry. *Metanoia* is given great importance in the Synoptics where it means conversion to God, a return to the God of the Covenant as a condition for entering the realm of salvation. Conversion is both a call and a gift given to all including the Gentiles.

After sorting out the basic issues the author comes to grips with the real problem in the second part of his study. Why does Paul apparently disregard such a basic concept as *Metanoia* so important in the Synoptics and the Acts? Why is it pushed into the background instead of its being treated as one of the central

themes? Fr Pathrapankal systematically works towards a solution through an analysis of the discourses in Acts attributed to St Paul and the relevant passages in the Pauline Epistles.

Paul uses the term *epistrephein* to denote the conversion of the Gentiles and the turning of the Jews to Christ. It is surprising that the word *Metanoia* is not central in his theology. But Paul does in fact combine the idea of *Metanoia* with Faith. In effect it remains in the call to Faith. Paul understands Faith as including the *Metanoia* of the Synoptics and of the Acts. In his theology Faith is more significant than *Metanoia* as a means of entering the new sphere of redemption.

This new Covenant is established in the death and resurrection of Christ. Formerly men were alienated from God; they stood in the wrath of God. God revealing his justice in Christ Jesus established him as the centre of the redemptive history. Fr Pathrapankal argues that the "concept of the new covenant is necessary for a correct understanding of pauline Christology." Although explicit references might be few there is evidence of Paul's deep conviction that the new way of redemption is the establishment of a new covenant promised in the Old Testament.

Faith in Christ is the means of entering the new covenant. This faith includes an acknowledgement of God's eschatological intervention in Christ and a self surrender to God's redeeming act. The aspects of knowledge, trust, hope and obedience are included in it.

Next Fr Pathrapankal discusses the relation between Baptism and Faith. Baptism is no symbolic or magical rite, but the realization of Faith and *Metanoia*. On the part of man it expresses his conversion and faith while on the part of God it is the act of renewal of man and of incorporation in Christ. Through it the new Covenant community is constituted.

In the last chapter Fr Pathrapankal sums up the results of his investigation.

This work is well conceived and systematically executed. Although the field is vast Fr Pathrapankal never loses his way. He is clear-minded and sure of his subject. In some sections the author is masterly. Still his arguments are not always fully persuasive. The prophets do not use the word Covenant or appeal to it directly. They do not appeal to the Covenant obligations, nor are their moral demands based on it. 'Shubh' can well be understood in other connexions too. Perhaps where they come nearest to the Covenant is in the 'rib' patterns. The prophets do appeal to fidelity and obedience. But they can be understood and explained in other relations as well.

The same difficulty is felt in the explanation of Faith. The explanation of Faith in the Covenant context is not fully convincing. The great prophet of Faith, Isaiah, does not seem to understand it within the framework of the Covenant, nor does the prophet Habakkuk (incidentally, it would have been good for the author to have examined the teaching of Habakkuk on Faith.) The same can be said of wrath. Although the author takes it as a Covenant concept wrath by nature seems to be vindictive. It is revealed even against the Gentiles who do not belong to the Covenant (Ex. 15, 7; Wisd. 11, 9; Rom. 1, 18.)

Though the Covenant concept is prominent in Hebrews it does not stand out in the letters of St. Paul. In fact Paul uses the term very rarely. He is more concerned with the promise of God than with the Covenant. It is indeed striking that Moses and Sinai play a very minor role in his theology. By contrast Abraham and Adam stand out in relief. The paragon of Faith and the father of the believers, Abraham is a towering figure in St Paul. The new economy is related to him. Paul envisages the redemption as a new creation and the fulfilment of the promises to Abraham. He consciously extricates himself from the Covenant context in the Epistles to the Romans 4 and in Galatians 3.

Besides what the author observes concerning Metanoia and Faith in St Paul (the implicit idea of Metanoia in Faith) is also true of St John.

On p. 141 Fr Pathrapankal observes that the role of the servant as a preacher to the Gentiles has clear parallels in the 'servant' Songs and cites Is. 42, 7, 16.

The format of the book is good and the printing according to Indian standards excellent. By oversight a few spelling mistakes have crept into the text. Eg. Meschen (p. 24), dun (p. 24), participation (p. 26), Philipians (p. 28), Brigaux (p. 28), Fatih (p. 52), dess (p. 58), standight (p. 62), untersughungen (p. 83), Bembloux (p. 89), vida (p. 157), Haebraica (p. 143), Ungerechigkeit (p. 177), Ermahnunb (p. 269), historie (p. 288). Besides there are slight defects in the citing THWNT (p. 62), Bellum Judaicum (p. 47), 'Metanoia... (p. 94), Syrsin (p. 104), Dusseldorf (p. 180), Lagrange (209), H. J. Krauss (p. 222). But these minor defects do not, in any way, mar the excellence of this work. As an investigation of two Biblical, especially Pauline concepts, this study will prove very helpful to all those who are interested in Pauline theology.

St Thomas Seminary,
Kottayam-10

George Punnekottil

Contributors

FR K. LUKE, O. F. M. CAP. is Professor of Scripture and Oriental Science at Calvary College, Trichur-4. He holds a Licentiate in Theology from the Gregorian University, Rome, a Licentiate in Scripture from the Biblical institute, Rome and a Doctorate in Semitics from the Oriental institute of the University of Chicago. He has published a number of articles, both popular and scientific.

FR CHERIAN M. CURIYICAD, S. J. teaches H. Scripture at Vidya Jyoti, Institute of Religious Studies, Delhi-6. He studied at the Biblical Institute in Rome and in Jerusalem, gaining a Licentiate, having previously qualified in English literature. He has published articles in various theological and ascetico-spiritual periodicals.

FR ODILO MARIA LUKAS O. F. M CAP teaches Scripture at the Theologate in Kotagiri, The Nilgiris. He holds a Licentiate in Theology from the Gregorian University and a Licentiate in Scripture from the Biblical Institute. He is a member of the Committee for the translation of the Bible into Tamil; he has also published articles in the vernacular.

FR MATHEW VELLANICKAL is Professor of Sacred Scripture and Dean of Studies at St Thomas Apostolic Seminary, Vadavathoor, Kottayam. He studied at the Propaganda University, Rome and the Catholic University of Würzburg, Germany. He holds a Licentiate in Theology and a Doctorate in Scripture.

FR BERNARD BRYs, O. C. D. teaches Sacred Scripture in the Pontifical Institute of Theology, Alwaye (Kerala). He has been a regular contributor to *Eucharist and Priest*; his articles now continue to appear in *The Living Word*, the organ of the Theological Institute.

REV. ARVIND SHARMA is a student of divinity at the Harward Divinity School, 45 Francis Ave, Cambridge, Mass. 02138, U. S. A.

**Statement about Ownership and other Particulars
about Jeevadhara**

(Form IV — see Rule 8)

1. Place of Publication : Alleppey.
2. Periodicity of its Publication : Bi-monthly.
3. Printer's Name : Fr. Modestus, C. M. I.
Nationality : Indian
Address : St Joseph Press,
Mannanam.
4. Publisher's Name : Fr Constantine Manalel, C. M. I.
Nationality : Indian
Address : Theology Centre
Alleppey.
5. Editor's Name : Fr Constantine Manalel, C. M. I.
Nationality : Indian
Address : Theology Centre,
Alleppey
6. Names and addresses of individuals who own the Newspaper and partners or shareholders holding more than one percent of the total capital: Fr Constantine Manalel, C. M. I., Theology Centre. Alleppey.

I, Constantine Manalel, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

(Sd)

Publisher.